HE LIBERATOR:
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,
AT ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, No. 25 CORNHILL.
ary W. Williams, General Agent:

To whom all remittances are to be made and to be addressed, relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper.

TERMS—$2 50 per annum, payable in advance; or $3 00 at the expiration of six months.

Two copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.

Letters and communications must be POST PAID

ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cts.; one square

Financial Committee.

JAMES HOUGHTON, | SAMUEL PHILBRICK,
EDMUND JACKSON, | EDMUND QUINCY,
SAMUEL BOWDITCH, | WILLIAM BASSETT.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Editor.

THE LIBERATOR

OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD---OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND.

AGENTS.

MAINE.—A. Soule, *Bath*.
NEW-HAMPSHIRE.—N. P. Rogers, *Concord*;—William Wilbur, *Dover*;—Leonard Chase, *Milford*.
VERMONT.—John Bement, *Woodstock*;—Rowland T. Robinson, *North Ferrisburg*.
MASSACHUSETTS.—Moses Emery, *West Newbury*;—C. Whipple, *Newburyport*;—Luther Boutell, *Groton*; W. S. Wilder, *Fitchburg*;—J. T. Everett, *Princeton*; J. Church, *Springfield*;—Josiah Hayward, *Salem*; John Levy, *Lowell*;—Josiah V. Marshall, *Dorchester and vicinity*;—Richard C. French, *Fall River*; Isaac Austin, *Nantucket*;—Elias Richards, *Weymouth*;—B. P. Rice, *Worcester*;—Wm. C. Stone, *Watertown*;—A Bearse, *Centreville*;—Israel Perkins, *Lynn*;—B. Freeman, *Brewster*; R. F. Wallcut, *Dennis*;—George O. Harmon, *Haverhill*;—Joseph Brown, *Andover*;—Joseph L. Noyes, *Georgetown*;—John Clement, *Townsend*; George W. Benson, *Northampton*; Alvan Ward, *Ashburnham*.

[☞ For a continuation of this list, see the last page last column.]

J. BROWN YERRINTON, Printer.

VOL. XIII.---NO. 10. BOSTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1843. WHOLE NO. 635.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

The Intermarriage Law.

The ground on which most members have been disposed to pass the law is, that they believe the provisions of the present law is inoperative, and therefore the repeal will be harmless, because it will be merely negatory. A little inquiry, we believe, will show that any one that the present prohibitory law has been inoperative, but that the knowledge of its evasions are illegal in this State has prevented many contracted. Very few instances are known, of such parties going out of the State for the purpose of evading the law, as might be done, and doubtless would be done, if the fact that the act is illegal within the State, and upon it a stigma, sufficient in most cases to prevent.

The strongest argument which has been considered of any weight in favor of repeal, is the supposed hardship visited upon the offspring of such illegal marriages, as it is said. If it were really an object to encourage such marriages and the increase of such a class of citizens, there would be something in this argument. But if not, how is it a greater hardship to the offspring of parents of different colors to be subject to the penalties of illegitimacy, than to those of unmarried parents? If legislators are not to act upon this motive, why not grant the privilege of illegitimacy to all that class of persons who are subjected to this hardship? Is it only the colored who are entitled to this display of favor? We do not see the ground of the distinction.

The misfortune of these persons is severe enough, without adding their existence to so unnaturally severe a penalty; and if to this is added that of being deprived of the chances of inheritance, it will be evident that this disability arises from a law devised and in fact well calculated to prevent the evil complained of. If it do not in all cases prevent it, it is plain that the Legislature are desirous of granting to children the right of inheriting the property of their parents, and if the Legislature can find any reason for favoring this class of illegitimate children more than any other class, there is surely a mode of attaining the object, short of encouraging such marriages by removing the prohibition. It does not necessarily follow because the marriage is invalid and void as between the parties, the children should be deprived of the rights of inheritance, if the Legislature would order it otherwise.

We believe that the interest which has been manifested in this point, is sympathy thrown away.—There are very few cases where any hardship of this sort occurs,—much fewer than of cases where there is no legal obstacle to the marriage of the parties.

The other disabilities of the offspring of such marriages are imposed by a power which no human power can remove. These are sufficient to show that they ought not to be encouraged or tolerated by the laws by which the institution of marriage is upheld. The first of these is a disability to assume terms of intimacy and equality, with perhaps the same race with either father or mother. We say that it ought not to be so—that such persons ought to be received into families, and into the social and intimate intercourse, exactly as if they were of the same complexion. It is a sufficient reason that they are not and never will be so received. The disability is ten fold more severe to every child of color than what has been called by a writer on the subject, the 'curse of illegitimacy,'—which curse, as we have shown, may be removed in a single age, has been doubled in this State, as appears by the census, by emigrations within ten years, and is nothing.

It is not expected that there will be some practical result from the passage of this repeal, why are its friends so earnest for it? It has now been before the public, many of whom certainly have a great repugnance to it, year after year, with a pertinacity which indicates a deep interest in it. The high tariff law and the bankrupt law have been urged with like pertinacity, it was because there were those standing ready to take advantage of them. We do not say that the advocates themselves of those measures supported them on account of their own personal interest in them, but because they believed there were persons who had such an interest, or that they were measures of practical utility, according to a beneficial practical result. We may imagine, why a person acting under a conviction in regard to the practical utility of the measure now in question, should exert himself with like zeal in support of it, but it is difficult to imagine one being so philanthropic, as to throw so much effort upon an object of mere theoretical reform, without the expectation of any practical result. It is one of those curious problems, for which there is yet to be given, why there should be so much zeal for a mere theoretic reform, of which the practical results, should there be any, as is apprehended, will be of so formidable and repulsive a character.

THE LIBERATOR

[Reported for the Liberator.]

Remarks of Mr. Prince, of Essex,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Upon the Bill to repeal the 'Intermarriage Law.'

MR. SPEAKER:—As I am one of the young members of this House, I shall not assume to be in possession of superior wisdom upon the subject now occupying the attention of this body; but I must say that I am in favor of the passage of the bill now before us, for one great reason, above all others which might be named; and that is,—that the existence of the statute called the 'Intermarriage Law,' serves to perpetuate and deepen that prejudice against the colored race, which depresses them continually, which crowds them down, and deters them from attaining to that rank in community which they are capable of occupying. They are degraded, kept down in the estimation of many, in consequence of our laws; they have not the inducements that others have, for rising in the world; they are treated by many, and practically regarded by our laws, as if they were semi-monkeys or baboons; they have been insultingly termed the connecting link of the intellectual and brute creation; and *the tendency of the 'intermarriage law' is to foster and extend this idea!* We have laws, with severe penalties annexed, prohibiting the cohabitation of a *human being* with a *brute*; and in addition to this, we have the intermarriage law, which makes it illegal for a white man (so called) to sustain the relation of husband to an African, mulatto, or Indian female, and the same *vice versa*. Now, with these facts before us, I see not how any one can avoid perceiving that the existence of the last-named law must operate to the detriment of the colored population. While this law is continued in force by the Legislature, (the usually termed concentrated wisdom of the State,) the colored people in this Commonwealth will be esteemed as ranking some where between brutes and intellectual beings. Gentlemen may (as they have here) object to the expression, 'degradation of the colored race,' being used in this connexion; and they may assert that the condition indicated by this phrase does not result from the law under consideration; but the truth of the statement I have just made, concerning the *manner* in which they are degraded, cannot, I think, be evaded. Under these circumstances, how can we expect the colored population of this State, as a whole, to rise, intellectually and morally? How can we expect them to aspire to usefulness, to high moral worth, and to attainments in literary and scientific knowledge? Just so long as we degrade a portion of the human race to the rank of a brute, we must expect that their thoughts and aspirations will be but little above those of a brute—I mean, so far as their *station in society*, and their projecting and executing laudable schemes and enterprises, are concerned.

Some gentlemen have expressed their apprehensions that, if this law is repealed, amalgamation will become very prevalent in this State. I do not believe it! Where, Sir, does amalgamation *now* prevail, to the greatest extent? At the *South!* Where do we find that class of people termed mulattoes, the most numerous? *In the slaveholding States!* And they spring, *not* from matrimonial alliances, founded upon mutual affection, but from *illicit intercourse!* The slaveholders often sell their own children. A certain 'old man eloquent' once asked, in Congress, if some members, who were slaveholders, had not seen *striking likenesses* of themselves running round on the plantations. And we fellowship, and treat as respectable, the immediate authors of this state of thungs; while we continue in existence a law which degrades, and renders illegitimate their children, so that they are prevented from holding property, as others are permitted to do. Suppose some citizen of Boston should visit a southern State, and he should be entertained at a slaveholder's dwelling, by a sumptuous feast, or party; and suppose that a slave, the *offspring* of the slaveholder himself, should peep in upon the scene of festivity, and see his reputed master enjoying the companionship of his northern friend; would he not think it a hard case, to say the least, that his master, his *natural father*, should be held in such high repute by an individual coming from a State where the laws made *him* almost a criminal for his *color*—a matter over which he himself never had any control?

But, admitting that marriages between persons of different shades of complexion *would* be more frequent, in case this law were repealed—are the consequences any more, or *so much*, to be dreaded, as the consequences of some matrimonial alliances that are now tolerated and most solemnly sanctioned? For instance, consumptive people frequently marry, and bring into the world children having disease, and consequent wretchedness entailed upon them; and we have no legislation to prevent it. A man habituated to intoxication—a lazy, improvident spendthrift, may marry,—and we raise no legislative arm against it. A person may have contracted a certain loathsome, (and, in this place, nameless,) disease, and transmit it to his innocent children, in consequence of which they may drag out a miserable existence, and we never think of making *laws* to prevent the evil; but we continue, year after year, an old foolish law, that certain persons shall not marry others, solely on account of color. Some have charged those, who ask for the repeal of this law, with a desire to promote amalgamation. I hardly think any sensible man really believes this charge true. We do not entertain any such idea. We do not believe that intermarriages between different classes of persons will be any more frequent than they have been formerly. But we wish the law abolished, because, in our view, it is unchristian and anti-republican, and because it is a matter about which we have no right to legislate. Every man should be left free to choose whom he pleases for his partner. And if consequences which we lament arise, correct them by advice, and the diffusion of correct physiological principles. I might adduce the testimony of eminent physiologists, to show that people of similar bodily proportions—such as two short-necked persons—beget children for disease and an early grave. Now admitting these opinions to be true—and doubtless they are—why should we *legislate* upon such subjects? What *right* have we to *prohibit* such marriages? None at all. So I say of the marriage of white and colored people. It is a matter which should be left to the taste, judgment and sense of propriety of mankind; and we should seek to sway men's minds in relation to it, only by the dissemination of physiological truth.

The law now under consideration prohibits the marriage of white people with *Indians*, &c. Now it is a fact, that John Randolph, of Virginia, was a lineal descendant of Pochahontas; he was the offspring, (somewhat remote, it is true,) of a marriage between an Englishman and a North-American Indian! Randolph was not made illegitimate by any law; he was permitted to hold a seat as a member of Congress. And here I wish to ask, How *far*, through how many generations, must African or Indian blood be diluted, before it can attain to respectability? What standard can we set up—what criterion can we establish—in relation to this matter? The truth is, it is extremely arbitrary to enact laws making distinctions of this kind.

One gentleman [Mr. Fowle of Boston] has told us that the colored or African race are *inferior* to the whites. I shall not occupy much of the time of this House in refuting this idea. My reading, I acknowledge, has not been *very* extensive; but I have always understood the testimony of HERODOTUS to be, that the ancient Egyptians, renowned for their skill in the arts and sciences, were woolly-headed, flat-nosed negroes. And Dr. GEORGE COMBE in his 'Constitution of Man,' (a good authority, certainly,) gives it as his deliberate opinion, that Africans are fully equal in mental calibre to any race; but he remarks that they are distinguished from others by a lack of energy, and a submissiveness of disposition. Indeed, the supposition that colored people are inferior to others, in point of intellectual strength and acuteness, and that they fall behind others in advancement when allowed equal opportunities for culture, is so preposterous, that I will not take farther notice of it.

It has been said, during the discussion upon this matter, that there is an anatomical difference between the colored race and the whites. So there is between Englishmen and Scotchmen, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians, Asiatics, &c. But why have *legislative* distinctions, pointing out differences of this character? If, as has been said, Nature exhibits such marked and eternal differences, why not permit Nature to have her perfect work?

And besides this, all who are well acquainted with human nature, know, that prohibitions frequently awaken an itching desire to commit the very thing prohibited. In corroboration of this statement, I might mention the fact, (which should serve to allay the fears of those who are professedly apprehensive that the repeal of the law will tend to the increase of amalgamation,) that there is no law like that now being considered, in any other New-England State! and yet, I venture to assert that the number of persons termed mulattoes is vastly greater in Massachusetts than any where else in New-England!

There is one other consideration to which I will refer, before I conclude my remarks; which is, that the law in question is *inoperative*, except in its debasing and oppressive influence; it is entirely negatory, as far as any prevention of the practice prohibited is concerned,—it must be so, from its nature. If one person has conceived a passionate preference for another, and the feeling be reciprocal, no matter what the difference between them may be, you cannot easily prevent them from consummating their wishes. If prevented from doing so here, they will cross the boundary line of the State, and their accomplish their object. A certain character in an old play, is represented as having said, 'The strongest oath is but as straw to the fire that burns i' the blood.' We cannot, very effectually, interpose a barrier between a love-fancy and its object. Such a barrier will be

> 'severed as the flax
> That falls asunder at the touch of fire.'

For the reasons which I have now mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the repeal of the Intermarriage Law; and I ardently hope that, at this session, we shall wipe out this stain from the statute book of this Commonwealth,—that we shall number this odious relic of barbarism among the things that were!

Vote on the Intermarriage Law.

The bill to repeal the intermarriage law came up in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, Feb. 22, on its passage to be engrossed.

Mr. TOPPAN, of Newburyport, moved to postpone the bill indefinitely, and called for the yeas and nays upon this motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered by 110 to 92.

The indefinite postponement was advocated by Messrs. Greene of Cambridge, Fowle of Boston, Bates of Charlemont, and Howland of Dartmouth; and opposed by Messrs. Prince of Essex, Pettes of Boston, and Whitmarsh of Seekonk.

Mr. CHURCH, of Westport, moved the previous question.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Boston, wished to offer the following amendment, which he read, viz: 'Provided, however, that nothing in this act contained shall in any way be construed to be a sanction, on the part of this Legislature, to the intermarriage of white persons with negroes, mulattoes, or other individuals of African descent'—and he, therefore, hoped the previous question would not be ordered.

The previous question was, however, ordered, and so the motion for indefinite postponement was cut off.

Mr. ADAMS called for the yeas and nays on the engrossment, and they were ordered—124 to 123.

The question was then taken, and the bill passed to be engrossed, by yeas 174, nays 139, as follows:

SUFFOLK. *Yeas*—Adams, Bigelow, Blake, Dwight, Gray, Greele, Greene, Howe, Howes, Lincoln, Lowe, Montgomery, Palfrey, Ezra Palmer, J. A. Palmer, Pettes, Preston, Stevenson, Wales, Wellington, Wheeler, Ilsley.

Nays—Blodgett, Dillaway, Fowle, Gibbens, Holbrook, Leavitt, McAllister, Park, Parrot, Thaxter, Tolman, Wiggin.

ESSEX. *Yeas*—Osgood, Abbott, King, Prince, Stickney, Burnham, Day, Saunders, Brimblecom, Houghton, Long, Buckman, Hewes, Marshall, Moody, Chapman, Wheatland, Ward, Morrill, Newhall, Cook.

Nays—Peabody, Tappan, Lindsey, Ramsdell, Toppan, Foster.

MIDDLESEX. *Yeas*—Harrington, Eames, Stone, Baldwin, Sawyer, Thomas, Kittredge, Wright, Hildreth, Boutwell, Hardy, Douglass, Richardson, Smith, Tyler, Rice, Gregg, Turbell, Tufts, Bryant, Peck, Grout, Russell, Chandler, Bingham, N. A. Richardson.

Nays—Walker, J. D. Greene, Plympton, T. Green, Sanborn, Hemenway, A. Leland, Whitney, Muzzy, Howe, Tower, Lawrence, Hill, Travis, C. W. Leland, Robinson, Moore, Livingston, Sceva, Wheeler, Gowing.

WORCESTER. *Yeas*—Barrett, Holland, Cotton, Howe, Crocker, Wright, Harlow, Dunton, Washburn, Sargent, Burrage, Boutwell, T. Taft, Wetherbee, Gale, Wakefield, Hapgood, Albee, C. T. Fisher, Hathaway, Ireson, Brown, Bacon, Kinnicutt.

Nays—Jones, Bancroft, Boomer, Bolcom, Converse, Paige, Flagg, Cobb, Tidd, Dyer, Conant, Goulding, Parker, Fay, Travis, Green, Houghton, Hyde, Legg, C. Taft, N. E. Fisher, Greenwood, Brooks, Willard.

HAMPSHIRE. *Yeas*—Hannum, Samuel Nash, A. Ingham, Barrett, Thurston, Simeon Nash, Goodrich, Burr.

Nays—Richards, White, Moody, Haskell, J. Smith, Aldrich.

HAMPDEN. *Yeas*—Wheeler, Knowlton, Bell, Booth, Foskit, Hedge, Bagg, Ufford.

Nays—Eli, Elder, Dunham, Puffer, Calkins, Frye, Fowler, Carpenter.

FRANKLIN. *Yeas*—Cushman, Arms, Nime, Lathrop, Hastings, Adams, Himes, Clapp, Allen, Reed, Kellogg, Taft, Russell, Stone.

Nays—Bates, Stewart, Bascomb, Smith, Howard, Haskins.

BERKSHIRE. *Yeas*—Jenks, Wadsworth, Whitcomb, Strickland, Kellogg, Richmond, Cudworth.

Nays—Badger, Ticknor, Farnum, Joyner, Woodworth, Eames, Young, Ball, Hyde, Abbey, McIntyre, Warner, Wells, Spencer, Torrey, Prince.

NORFOLK. *Yeas*—Morrison, Loud, Dane, Breck, Gregory, Wales, Walley, Tucker, Richards, Pratt, Warner.

Nays—Crooks, Endicott, Lincoln, Ellis, Ford, Scott, Mason, Hunt, Smith, Jackson, Talbott.

BRISTOL. *Yeas*—Richards, Townsend, T. K. Wilbur, Williams, Morton, Slade, Hodges, Rotch, Whitmarsh, D. Wilbour, Presbury, White, Haskins, Church.

Nays—Wilmarth, Howland, Pitts, Robinson, White, Weaver, Kempton, Staples, Taber, Crane, Kent, Lincoln, Luther, Buffington, Read.

PLYMOUTH. *Yeas*—Thompson, Josselyn, Tower, Bartlett, Little, Robinson, Kingman, Hitchcock, Sherman, Bagnall, Meigs, Fogg, Vinal, Richards.

Nays—Gay, Savery, Osborn, Lewis, Shurtleff, Bradford.

BARNSTABLE. *Yeas*—Handy, Taylor, Howes, Collins, Kenney.

Nays—Hinckley, Freeman, Nye, Higgins, S. A. Paine, I. Paine, Hale.

DUKES. *Yeas*—Norton.

Nays—None.

NANTUCKET. *Yeas*—Baker, Barney, Dennis.

Nays—None.

Eleventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts A. S. Board of Managers.

The Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, which was presented to the Society at its late anniversary in Faneuil Hall, is now ready for delivery to the members, at 25, Cornhill. It was written by EDMUND QUINCY, and occupies about 80 octavo pages. It is an admirable document, both in manner and matter, from which we intend to extract liberally for our columns.

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT IN CASE OF PRIGG.

Such is the substance of this celebrated decision of the Supreme Court; a decision which sweeps away by a breath all safeguards of our personal liberties, which the jealous care of our ancestors, for five hundred years, has been devoted to secure for us. And this by the tribunal which the people have established as the sacred depository of their liberties, where they might be safe even from their own excesses! The bitterness of the wound is enhanced by the knowledge of the trusted hands that dealt it—as poison seems to its victim more deadly, when administered by his Confessor, in the Eucharist. By this decision, the personal liberty of every inhabitant of the free States is placed at the mercy of a single Judge, selected by his enemy. The right of trial by jury, though guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, is denied by it in the case in which, of all others, it is the most precious, not even excepting that which touches life itself, and the laws securing it to their inhabitants by some of the States, in cases affecting their liberty, inferentially declared to be void. The writ of habeas corpus is forever suspended, in the case in which its interference is the most essential to personal liberty. If a man claim the horse of another as his property, he must establish his claim to the satisfaction of a jury of the country. If he claim a man as his chattel personal, by mistake or perjury, he may carry him off into hopeless slavery by the certificate of a single justice of the peace, who may be the vilest and most abandoned of men,—who may, by possibility, be abiding a trial that will consign him to the penitentiary or the gallows. The whole tone of the decision is marked by the assumption that the preservation of the blessings of slavery, and not of liberty, to themselves and their posterity, was the guiding purpose of the framers of the Constitution; and to the accomplishment of that great end, all the rights of the inhabitants of the free States must be sacrificed. If this be indeed the meaning of the Constitution of government which our fathers purchased with their blood, the battles of the Revolution were fought in vain. The star-chamber and court of high commission, in their most despotic days, never claimed for any tyrant such a power as this. If this be indeed the law of the land, and if it cannot be speedily changed, then, upon the principles in which men glory as those of the conflict of Seventy-Six, the moment of Revolution has arrived. If ever a state of things existed, which justified an appeal to arms for deliverance from intolerable assumptions and abuses of arbitrary power, it is the one which this decision of the Supreme Court announces to be the lawful and constitutional condition of the inhabitants of the free States. It is the business of abolitionists to endeavor, by peaceable means, to avert the necessity of this fearful remedy for intolerable grievances. Let us labor earnestly in this our godlike vocation. But, if, in spite of all our efforts, the Constitution shall still be held to be a lie to us, which strips us of all our rights, in the name of liberty, and places the insolent foot of the slave-master upon our necks, may we all exclaim, with one accord, and with an earnest purpose, LET THE CONSTITUTION PERISH! If the bond of this boasted Union be indeed but links of iron, binding our free limbs to the triumphal car of slavery, as it crushes beneath its wheels all that we hold most dear, MAY THE UNION BE SHIVERED, AND THAT SPEEDILY, INTO A THOUSAND FRAGMENTS!

TEXAS AND MEXICO.

Our relations with Mexico during the past year have been eminently disgraceful to us. Exulting in a real or fancied superiority, our conduct towards her has been characterized by the most insulting arrogance. A minister to her court was selected as if with a design to insult and annoy her by the presence of a known enemy to herself, and an open friend to her revolted province. And when, not long after Mr. Thompson had entered upon his functions, he received a letter from Mr. Webster, instructing him how to reply to a remonstrance on the part of the Mexican Secretary of State against the aggressions of the United States, the annals of Diplomacy, though it has been styled 'the science of lies,' can hardly furnish a parallel to the stupendous audacity of its falsehood. Within a half-dozen years of the time when the government of the United States looked quietly on, and saw men, money and munitions of war pouring across the Sabine, to aid the Texan insurrection, while a strict *cordon* of troops were stretched along the St. Lawrence, to turn back northern help from the Canadian revolt, and when a detachment of the United States army, under Gen. Gaines, marched seventy miles into the Mexican territory, 'to maintain neutrality,' the American Secretary of State has the amazing assurance to stand up before the world, and deny that there had ever been any violation, on the part of the government of the United States, of its neutral duties! And he then coolly proceeds, with the logic of Æsop's wolf to the lamb, to show that the United States is the innocent victim, and Mexico the arrogant aggressor! There was at that period an evident intention on the part of the slave interest to involve this country in a Mexican war; and Mr. Clay significantly said, in the Senate, that there was more danger of war in that quarter than with Great Britain. This plan, however, seems to be dropped for the present; but it is impossible to say how soon it may be resumed. It is to be hoped that this change of policy was occasioned by intimations from Lord Ashburton as to the view which his government would take of an attempt to annex Texas to the United States. Unless this be the case, such is the poverty and weakness of Texas, and such the desire of the slave interest to get the control of her, that the North may look for speedy efforts to saddle upon her energies and resources the protection and support of a fresh horde of unrepentant prodigals in the great Valley of Rascals.

IRELAND.

From Ireland we continue to receive assurances of the intelligent and cordial sympathy and co-operation of many noble spirits. Their good wishes and helping hands cheer and encourage us. We regret that their generous philanthropy does not inspire the breasts of more of their countrymen, who have made the United States their adopted home. The Irish Address, signed by DANIEL O'CONNELL and THEOBALD MATHEW, and sixty thousand Irishmen beside, of which an account is contained in our last Report, created a world of sensation throughout the land. Every species of argument and of artifice were used to prevent its having its due effect. And with but too much success. Recreant Irishmen seemed to be ambitious of outshining their free and enlightened neighbors in their vulgar and cruel prejudices. That the great mass of the uneducated peasantry, who had been trodden beneath the feet of all in their own country, should feel elated at finding themselves suddenly elevated to the peerage of the skin, and should enjoy the new pleasure of trampling upon others, was not, perhaps, to be wondered at. But it was humiliating to see the better informed class of emigrants,—the clergy, the editors, the orators,—infected by breathing the pestilential atmosphere that hangs over the land, with the very spirit of tyranny which they fled from their native shores to escape. And, above all, was it mortifying to perceive the effect of the unlooked for issue of this movement upon the great Agitator himself; to see him humbling himself before the false public sentiment of a slave-ridden land, from the paltry fear of losing to his favorite Agitation, the precarious possibility of a few blood-stained dollars!

POLITICAL PARTIES.

Nothing has occurred during the past year to take either of the great political parties out of the pro-slavery category, in which anti-slavery has long since placed them. Individuals in both have shown a disposition to apply their distinctive idea to the subject of slavery; but, as bodies, they are rival suitors for her smiles. The Whigs have opened the electioneering campaign by placing before the nation the name of HENRY CLAY, of Kentucky, as the candidate of their choice for the Presidency. This disgraceful nomination has been made in several of the States, without waiting for a general Convention, including, we regret to say, our own. The party, or the individual, that can sanction the nomination of this 'bold bad man'—the most unblushing and the most subtle of the champions of slavery—to fill the highest office in the nation, deserves to be branded as hostile to human freedom. The whole course of Mr. Clay, while it has shown him not to be blind to the curse slavery brings upon the land, has proved him to be ready to sacrifice the true interests of the country and the rights of millions of his countrymen to the gratification of his selfish ambition, and to the aggrandizement of the interests of his party. There is no public man in the country, whom abolitionists should regard with more jealousy and suspicion than Mr. Clay. The ungovernable violence of George McDuffie, and the calmer, but not less deadly, hostility of John C. Calhoun, are harmless, compared with the crafty arts of this wily politician. No man among slaveholding statesmen has made baser or more fatal compromises with the slave power—compromises of which all the concessions were on the side of liberty. This unblushing prostitution of his great name and his great powers to defend and sustain that abominable system on the floor of the Senate, and his insulting reply to the respectful address of the Friends in Indiana, are fresh in the remembrance of us all. He is, moreover, at the head of that giant Imposture, the American Colonization Society, which has for its object the perpetuation of slavery by the expatriation of the free people of color, and which is the fostering nurse of the cruel prejudice which crushes the hearts of that unhappy class of our countrymen. The agents of this double-faced handmaid of slavery, (Messrs. Gurley and Bulfinch,) have been busy in New-England during a portion of the last year—happily, we believe, with very small success; but, as a part of the fruits of their labors, a communication from the Managers of the Massachusetts Colonization Society appeared in the Boston papers, marked by the audacity of misrepresentation which has ever characterized the public statements of that Society and its auxiliaries, stating its great necessities, and commending it to public patronage, and concluding with the modest opinion, that 'it is justly entitled to the countenance and to a reasonable support from the government of the country'! This document was signed by Dr. J. V. C. Smith, Chairman; Rev. Messrs. Wm. M. Rogers, Wm. Hague, Parsons Cooke, Geo. W. Blagden, Lyman Coleman and B. B. Edwards, and Messrs. Henry Edwards and Albert Fearing—some of which gentlemen are prominent Whigs, and all of whom, we believe, are members of that party. So that, in the event of Mr. Clay's election, we may hope to have those ruinous Colonies saddled upon the industry of the free States, in addition to all the rest of the burdens which slavery has entailed upon it. That some attempt will be made, should Mr. Clay succeed to the Chair of the State, to bring this infernal machine, which has been discarded in disgust even by its old friends, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, to bear more effectually upon the rising hopes of emancipation, is highly probable from the nature of the case and the character of the man. This man thus deeply committed to the defence, and steeped in the guilt, of slaveholding—whose daily bread and necessary raiment are extorted from unpaid laborers—who buys and sells men and women like sheep or bullocks—is the first choice of Puritan Massachusetts for the highest office in her gift! And when, in Faneuil Hall, the question was asked of the Convention that thronged its walls, whom they would have to reign over them, the roof was almost rent with the shouted name of Henry Clay, the manstealer and the duellist! And how many of those men, with whose voices the old walls rung again, were chosen vessels of the churches of Massachusetts! In the midst of the many glorious memories that hang around that world-famous Hall, there are some recollections which they who reverence it would fain have obliterated from their minds—and amongst these this scene occupies a painful pre-eminence. We are happy to know, however, that there is small probability of this nomination being sanctioned by the people. In Ohio, New-York and Massachusetts—the States on which the friends of Mr. Clay most confidently relied—the Whig candidates for Governor have been defeated, and because, it is supposed, their election would be considered as an acceptance of his nomination.

The Democratic party have not yet selected their candidate, though Mr. Calhoun has been nominated by the Legislature of South Carolina. Whoever the candidate may be, however—be it Calhoun, Benton, Johnson, Buchanan, Van Buren, or Cass—whether southern tyrant or northern sycophant,—we may be sure that none will be selected who is not ready to lick the dust before the Idol of the nation.

There are indications, however, that a change in the character of the political parties impends, and there is reason to believe that they will finally divide on the true issue—of slavery and anti-slavery—of North and South. To this complexion they must come at last; and the sooner the politics of the country take this natural posture, the better for the parties and for the country.

Great Anti-Corn Law Meetings.

The Manchester (Eng.) Guardian of the 4th ultimo contains the proceedings, reported at great length, at the Great Anti-Corn Law Meetings and Banquets held in that city, in a hall estimated to contain more than four thousand persons, which was crowded to overflowing. Eloquent and powerful speeches were delivered on the occasion by Daniel O'Connell, Dr. Bowring, J. S. Buckingham, and other distinguished men. The Guardian gives the following sketch of the remarks made by our estimable American (or, rather, Christian) coadjutor, HENRY C. WRIGHT, who was happily present as the advocate of suffering humanity.

Mr. H. C. WRIGHT, of Philadelphia, who was introduced by the Chairman as an anti-slavery man, though from a slaveholding country, said he had listened with amazement to the accounts of the suffering people of England, given during these three days. It was far worse than the worst he had ever anticipated. After hearing the accounts from Leeds, Coventry, Sunderland, Liverpool, Bristol, Bath, Dundee, Glasgow, and Paisley, that long-suffering town—he was deeply excited on this subject, and should be ashamed of himself if he were not. He was interested in this question, not as an American or a Briton, as of this or that sect or party, but because he was a man, and as a brother of all mankind. The question belonged to no sect, party, or country, but to the world. (Applause.) The object of the anti-corn-law league could never be attained, till the British ships could go from the North to the South pole, and enter every port under heaven, and exchange their goods on perfectly free terms. After describing the Mississippi and its tributaries, and the valley of the Mississippi, as one of the noblest corn-growing countries on the face of the globe, he said they could raise corn enough there to feed the population of the globe. (Hear.) The Americans could bring from the far interior their produce immediately into the British market, by steam, as soon as it was cut down, and thrashed and ready for market. It had struck him, from all he had heard,—and he had been taking notes, and faith he would print some of them—(laughter)—and he had reduced it all to this simple problem: 'The people of England want bread—America has got bread for you—who shall forbid us to bring it here?' (Applause, and 'Hear.') The people of this country were starving for want of bread; America was full of it; they knew not what to do with it; and who should say they should not bring it here?—(Hear.) It was a shame and disgrace to any people under heaven, to say that a starving people should not be fed. ('Hear,' and applause.) If any private gentleman were to manage his affairs as both the English and American people had done, his friends would send him to a mad-house. (Hear.) On both sides the Atlantic, they were acting as if insane. What was a tariff, but starvation to the laborer? (Hear.) It said to him—'Work, work, work, but starve too.' (Hear.) The Americans said to the laborers—'Work, and eat too;' and that was what the anti-corn-law league wanted. (Hear.) It was amazing to him, that, on a question like this, there should be a single dissentient voice in Great Britain, or in the United States. But, on the other side of the Atlantic, there was a party working with them—(Hear)—the American democratic party had for its watchword, 'Free Trade.' (Applause.) According to accounts received from America, since I landed here, the democratic party will control the national council for the next Congress. For one, I am glad of it, if they will only carry the doctrine of free trade; but I am afraid of them, because they are truckling to the demon of slavery to get into power; and sure I am, that no party that truckles with slavery to gain power, can possibly benefit mankind. There are many views of this question which I should like to take, but I place myself here. Your question is a question of humanity; it is wide as the earth, broad as human nature; and I wish the anti-corn-law-league would all of them so regard it. Stretch out your arms; embrace the world. Glad was I to hear from Dr. Bowring, last night, that China is interested in this question; that Russia, that the Germanic States, that France, that Spain, that Italy, that the United States, and South America, all are watching the movements of the anti-corn-law league. The spirit of your voice is gone out to the ends of the earth; and on the tops of the mountains, and in the vales of the western continent, you may hear of the anti-corn-law league. And why should they not hear it? It is, in my estimation, a question that involves the destinies not only of England, but of other nations; and England now has it in her power to blot out of existence all the tariffs in the world. Now, shall she use that power?—What say you? (Yes, yes.) That depends upon you to say. Do you will it? (Yes.) If you do, it shall be done. If you demand that right shall be done, right will be done; for, if your hearts are in it, you will go to work with untiring energy, until you have blotted out every tariff from all nations. Open your ports to the world, and then other nations will open their ports to your manufactures. It has long been my conviction, that the British nation might do the work of the world, or, however, they might have done it some years ago; I know not whether they can go back to that state, but it is worth trying. It is not too late to cease to do wrong, and learn to do right. This question is one which leads all to shake hands together across the Atlantic. It is a question that draws us all into one common brotherhood. I love to think of that doctrine. I love to reach out my hand, and feel the firm grasp of an Englishman. And sure I am, that if England would step forth, and plant herself on a right footing in this matter, the United States would be obliged to blot out the tariff from her statute book. Now, why should I, in the United States, give two dollars more a yard for cloth, than England could furnish me with it? And why should you be obliged to pay so much a bushel more for corn, when we can furnish you with it so much cheaper? Ay, Sir, I will tell you why, as a man asked me a question this very day; he said, what should we do in case of war? If we raised not our corn, we could not declare war against you. Now, if that's to be the end of the anti-corn-law league, God bless you, say I, with all my heart; and I am sure that it will be the end. Give us free trade, and how can we fight? Why, it will come to this in the course of time.—We should be dependant upon you for your manufactures, and you would depend upon us for corn; and do you think you would go to war with the people who furnish you with bread?—(no)—and do you think that we should go to war with you who were supplying us with manufactures? I am sure, Sir, that the way that the world is to be bound together, is by free trade all the world over. Adopt that as your watchword, and there are thousands and hundreds of thousands that will respond to you, and they will have their anti-corn-law league; and why should you not have a corresponding committee, to hold intercourse with the advocates of free trade? And let me suggest to this estimable body, that they have a corresponding committee, to hold intercourse with men of free trade principles all the world over. When he returned to America, and attempted to speak to the pro-slavery party there about the atrocities of slavery in the West Indies, they would point to the manufacturing districts in Great Britain, and say, 'Why do not the English take care of their own poor at home?' He did not, however, believe that the English poor were to be compared with American slaves, who were made the subjects of merchandize; but he thought there was some weight in the objection that might be urged against the anti-slavery advocate from England; and he trusted that, by repealing the corn-laws, and by that means elevating the condition of our laboring classes, we might, with greater force, urge on others the principles of freedom. (Cheers.) He would rather be a starved freeman, than a well-fed slave. Let him live and die a man. (Cheers.) Though he were to be poor, and starved, and frozen, by being a freeman, yet he would rather live and die such, than be clothed in scarlet and fine linen, and feed on angels' food, and live and die a slave. (Applause.) He hoped no exertions would be spared to effect the repeal of the corn-laws; then the starved population of England would be fed, and the reproach of the nation taken away. He trusted the league would go on, and prosper, and enlarge its borders, until the whole nation should be an anti-corn-law league, and the Queen its President. (Applause.) They should agitate, until America, and Russia, and even France, had joined them; ay, until the whole world had become one anti-corn-law league, and the whole human family united in the bonds of brotherhood. (Cheers.)

We shall give some further particulars of this splendid and majestic demonstration of the reform spirit in England, in another number.

Sensible.

The Norfolk (Va.) Beacon, speaking of the case of James B. Gray and George Latimer says—'Away with the paltry political issues and contests of the day, until this momentous question (slavery) is settled!' This does not look like 'dodging the question.' There is here no fear

LEGISLATIVE.

The Clergy and the Gallows.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Feb. 27.

Mr. PRINCE, of Essex, presented the following extraordinary petition of Joseph Southwick and 22 others, concerning capital punishment, and, at the request of the petitioners, he called for the reading of it, and it was read:—

'*To the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled:*

The undersigned, citizens of Massachusetts, respectfully represent that, in their opinion, capital punishment is not only inexpedient and inefficacious as a means of preventing crime, but contrary to the dictates of enlightened humanity and the law of God. They therefore pray your honorable bodies immediately to abolish such punishment in this Commonwealth.

If, however, such abolition shall, for any reason, be deemed inexpedient at the present time, your petitioners earnestly pray that the awfully solemn duty of hanging the convicted criminals, and ushering the guilty soul into the presence of God, instead of being longer imposed upon sheriffs, whose humane feelings are often shocked by such brutality, may hereafter be assigned to *hangmen*, such as your wisdom may enable you to select out of that numerous portion of the *clergy* who are the most zealous advocates of *judicial murder*, and through whose influence the inhuman practice has been so long continued. Your petitioners conceive that such an arrangement would be peculiarly fitting and proper, since the hanging of the criminal, if demanded by the requisitions of the divine law, is the most *solemn* and *sacred* duty imposed upon man, and ought to be performed only by men who have been *ordained* and *consecrated* as ministers of God. And your petitioners will ever pray.

February, 1843.

Joseph Southwick,	Alexander Wilson,
Henry W. Williams,	Hervey E. Weston,
William E. Haskell,	James B. Richards,
Samuel Larned,	Joseph A. Whitmarsh,
John Sawyer,	Nathaniel Gale,
Oliver Johnson,	Benjamin Pray,
Loring W. Reed,	Nath'l Wells, [for something else.]
Charles Brown,	
William A. White,	Joseph K. P. Porter,
John Curtis, Jr.	William G. Edwards,
Charles K. Whipple,	Levi Robinson,
Frederic S. Cabot.'	

In copying this petition, we have followed the *italicising* strictly. The reading created a great sensation.

Mr. GIBBENS, of Boston, said he felt shocked, and he had no doubt the feelings of the House were outraged and insulted by the proposal contained in it. He moved that the petition should not be received; called for the reading of the names, and hoped that it would be dismissed with the contempt which it deserved.

Mr. ALLEN, of Northfield, moved to lay the whole subject on the table. Not a vote—107 to 181.

Mr. GIBBENS amended his motion so as to stand, that the said petition be not received, because it is couched in improper language, and because it proposes to degrade a most respectable class of our fellow-citizens, without giving them a hearing.

Mr. WHITMARSH, of Seekonk, advocated the reception of the petition, and spoke in favor of abolishing capital punishment. He saw nothing so very startling in the request of the petitioners.

Mr. STEVENSON, of Boston, regretted that Mr. W. had taken such ground; and he considered it the strangest exhibition of democracy he had ever seen. He had contended that a highly respectable class of our fellow-citizens should be branded with disgrace, merely for approving of a law which was not only on our statute book, but which had always existed in every christian land. He considered the petition an outrage, not only on the House, but on the public. He charged upon the petitioners an intention of branding the character of those clergymen who differed with them in opinion, by proposing to reduce them to hangmen; and he was in favor of not receiving the petition.

Mr. BOUTELL, of Groton, did not consider that there was any thing in the petition disrespectful to the House, and therefore it ought to be received as a matter of course. It was a settled right in this Commonwealth to offer petitions not disrespectful in terms to the general court, and to have them considered.

Mr. ANDREWS, of Salem, said the *language* of the petition certainly was not disrespectful to the House.

Mr. ADAMS, of Boston, thought the petition had better take the usual course, and then we should hear no more of it. He thought the House had no right to *reject* the petition, as there was nothing in its language or spirit disrespectful to the House, although he regretted the bad taste and bad feelings which had influenced the petitioners to censure a respectable class of our citizens for holding opinions on the subject of capital punishment differing from their own.

Mr. GRAY was in favor of rejecting it at once, on the ground that it libelled a most respectable class in our community.

Mr. PARK was opposed to its rejection, as he feared the motive might be misunderstood; and he thought such a course would have a tendency to weaken the hands of our venerable champion for the right of petition, on the floor of Congress. The gentleman from Essex was a clergyman, and if he chose to degrade his own profession, why let him.

Mr. MOODY, of Harwich, supported the reception, and said he did not see anything disrespectful in the language. The petitioners only prayed that those people who were in favor of having certain acts done by the law, should be employed by the law to perform those acts. He thought it dangerous ground to take, that the opinions of the petitioners were such as the House ought not to listen to. The same ground supported the 21st rule of the House in Congress.

Messrs. Richardson, Holbrook, Brooks, Greele and Hyde, were in favor of instant rejection, as it was disrespectful to the House, to the clergy, and to the Christian religion.

Mr. HOWLAND, of Dartmouth, expressed himself very strongly against the sentiments of the petition, as being in the highest degree insulting to the House, and to the clergy—and he concluded by the following severe thrust at his political friend:—'Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that any member could be found, willing to present such a petition as this to the House—but, no sir, I am not surprised that *he* should do it.'

Mr. SCRYA, of Townsend, saw nothing disrespectful to the Legislature in the petition, though the proposition, in reference to other persons, was rather abhorrent to our general notions. He was for receiving and committing the report.

Mr. PRINCE, of Essex, said that he had presented the petition under the belief that it was prepared in proper form, and he thought so still.

Mr. HOLBROOK, of Boston, was greatly surprised by the petition, and said he looked upon it as an indignity offered to the House. He knew clergymen were in the habit of making knots, and knots which would not slip—knots which sometimes caused a great deal of trouble, but it never occurred to him that a clergyman was a proper person to discharge the duties of executioner on that account.

Mr. ALLEN, of Northfield, said he was satisfied from the course of the debate that he was correct in his motion to lay on the table, although the House had decided otherwise. He said he did not exactly understand the argument of degradation, which had been so much urged in reference to the duty of hangman. It was an office created by law, and at present its duties were imposed upon the sheriffs—a class of citizens of high standing in the community generally. He did not see any more degradation in calling upon a citizen to execute a sentence, than in calling upon him to pass the sentence. They were duties prescribed by law, and for that very reason could not be in any sense regarded as degrading.

Mr. HYDE, of Sturbridge, regarded the sentence 'judicial *murder*' as disrespectful to the law itself, and therefore disrespectful to the law-making authority.

Mr. LEONARD, after remarking that two or three hours had been spent on 'this *outrageous* and *infamous paper*,' moved the previous question, which was sustained, and the motion to reject was negatived, 118 to 158.

Mr. KINNICUTT moved that the petitioners have leave to withdraw. He thought the instant adoption of this motion would be a just rebuke of the sentiments of the petition, and he hoped the House would pursue this course.

Another attempt to lay the subject on the table, was again refused—Mr. GRAY moved the previous question.

Mr. WALLEY said, if the gentleman would withdraw his motion, he would move the appointment of a committee of three to consider and report what should be done with the petition.

The previous question was then ordered, and leave to withdraw was granted without a division.

WEDNESDAY, March 1.

A petition in favor of abolishing capital punishment, or of appointing hangmen out of 'the numerous body of the clergy who are in favor of hanging,' and by whose influence 'the inhuman and barbarous system of *judicial murder* is continued,' signed by James N. Buffum, and 25 other citizens of Lynn, was presented and read.

Mr. Walley moved to refer the petition to a special committee, to report what order should be taken on it.

Mr. Kinnicutt was opposed to this course. The House had received the petition—it had been read—he thought the members were prepared now to act upon it—and he hoped the petitioners would have instant leave to withdraw.

Mr. Boutwell was in favor of pursuing the ordinary course—he said the action of the House on Monday had caused the presentation of this petition—it had kindled a flame which could not easily be quenched.

Mr. Adams made a few remarks in support of Mr. Walley's motion, and moved the previous question.

This was opposed by Messrs. Gibbens and Stevenson, and supported by Messrs. Church and Allen.

The previous question was sustained, and the petition was referred, 222 to 37. [The committee consists of Messrs. Walley, Boutwell, Adams, White and Moody.] The committee, on Thursday, made the following report:—

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 2, 1843.

The Special Committee, to whom was referred the Petition of James N. Buffum and twenty-five others, citizens of Lynn, praying the abolition of capital punishment; or, if that be deemed inexpedient, that the office of hangman may be transferred from *sheriffs*, to such *clergymen* as are very zealous for the continuance of said punishment—have considered the same, and ask leave respectfully to

REPORT:

That, by the Constitution, the people have a right 'to request of the legislative body, by the way of addresses, petitions, or remonstrances, redress of the wrongs done them, and of the grievances they suffer.' The Constitution evidently implies, by the language used in the same article, that the right of petition shall be exercised in an orderly and peaceable manner; and parliamentary usage further requires that such petitions, &c. shall be *respectful in terms towards the legislative body*, in order that they may comply with these conditions of the Constitution.

Your committee have examined this petition, and find that it consists of two distinct parts; the former of which is a respectful prayer for the abolishment of capital punishment; and if the petition stopped here, your committee would recommend that the petition be laid upon the table, inasmuch as the joint committee have already agreed upon a report on that subject.

The latter part of the petition consists of a prayer that the office of *hangmen*, instead of being longer imposed on sheriffs, if capital punishments are not abolished, may be performed by a portion of the clergy, to be selected out of those of that profession who are the most zealous advocates of *judicial murder*, and through whose influence the inhuman practice has been so long continued. This is the substance of this part of the petition.

And your committee think that it is at least somewhat indecorous, to speak of an existing law of the Commonwealth as requiring its executive officers to be the instruments of judicial murder; if, however, the petitioners so regard the law, they are certainly warranted in using strong language to urge its repeal; but, not content with this, they go further, and request the Legislature to exercise an inquisitorial authority over the opinions of 'a numerous portion of the clergy,' for the purpose of ascertaining what is their conscientious belief as to the teachings of revelation upon the subject of taking life for the commission of any crimes against human society; and, having ascertained what their convictions are, that the Legislature shall proceed further, and require such portion of the clergy to be the executioners of the law on this subject.

It appears manifest to your committee, that the petitioners call upon the Legislature to do that which no human tribunal can do,—to search the hearts and judge the motives of their fellow-beings,—and, whatever the design of the petitioners may have been, and respectable as is the office of sheriff, and high-minded and humane as are the incumbents of that office, your committee cannot but regard the prayer of the petitioners as highly disrespectful to the clergy of our Commonwealth, as tending to hold 'a numerous portion' of them up to obloquy and contempt; and, especially, as invading the right of private judgment, which this respectable portion of our fellow-citizens are equally entitled to enjoy with the rest of the people of this Commonwealth; and for the undisturbed enjoyment of which, and the right to express their opinions, as to what are, and what are not, the laws of God and the language of inspiration, they certainly ought to be guaranteed, at least, an equal security and protection with other classes and individuals in the community.

Your committee hold the right of petition to be sacred and inviolable; that its preservation and full enjoyment, when respectfully exercised, is essential to the perpetuity of a free government; but they hold, as equally sacred, the right of private judgment, and that no class of the community ought ever to be arraigned for the peaceable and full expression of their opinions, upon matters which concern the welfare of society.

Your committee are aware, that petitions may be received, considered and disposed of, without the action of a committee, and yet without a violation of the Constitution; but they respectfully submit, as their unanimous opinion, that, in all cases where petitioners express their prayer in terms respectful to the Legislature, there is *far more danger of violating the right of petition*, by hasty or mistaken action, if the practice should obtain of considering petitions *instanter*, and giving petitioners leave to withdraw, without examination of their prayer by a committee, than there is of doing injustice to the very best of our fellow-citizens, by a reference of petitions to a committee, even if the language of the petitions seems discourteous and opprobrious towards any class in the community; added to which, such discussions as must be expected to arise upon the question of rejecting a petition, or, upon giving leave to withdraw, will be attended with much excitement and consumption of time, and will often fail therefore to result in a deliberate expression of the sense of the Legislature upon the subject of the petition.

Your committee are, however, of opinion, that when a subject has been considered by a committee and reported upon to the Legislature, it is no infringement of the right of petition, to lay upon the table without debate, and without reference, a petition resembling in its prayer the matter which has previously been reported upon.

Your committee recommend, for the reasons set forth in this report, that the petitioners have leave to withdraw.

All which is respectfully submitted.

Per order of the Committee,

SAM. H. WALLEY, Jr., *Chairman.*

[The petition of Joseph Southwick and others, after having been withdrawn from the House, agreeably to the vote of that body, was presented to the Senate, by whom it was unanimously referred to the Joint Committee on Capital Punishment; and on being sent down to the House for concurrence, was laid upon the table. Mr. Wright, of Norfolk, a few days since, presented a similar petition to the Senate, from nineteen citizens of Hanson, which was referred to the same Committee. We very much regret that, for want of space, we are unable to accompany the proceedings of the House, on this 'delicate' subject, with such comments as are suggested to our mind.—Altogether, it is a very remarkable and highly instructive affair, and will create quite a sensation, and much conversation and discussion, in and out of this Commonwealth. The proposition to appoint clergymen to officiate as hangmen is certainly a keen application of the *argumentum ad hominem*.]

REPORT ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The Joint Special Committee, to whom was referred so much of the documents appended to His Excellency's Message, of the 30th January last, as relates to the annexation of Texas to the United States, ask leave to

REPORT:

The papers referred to consist of resolutions passed by the Legislatures of the States of Tennessee and Mississippi. The preamble of the former runs as follows:

Whereas, the people of Texas have evinced an unconquerable love of liberty, by their Spartan firmness in the Alamo, and their heroic conduct at San Jacinto; and, whereas the same people have proved their capacity for self-government, by the adoption of their free and republican Constitution and laws,'

Your committee are of opinion that it requires something more than the *adoption* of a Constitution and laws to prove men's capacity for self-government; and something more than the incorporation into them of domestic slavery to prove their unconquerable love of liberty. Without, however, intending to go into any discussion of the subject at present, they deem the sentiment of the people of Massachusetts so decided as to require the adoption of some resolves, which they accordingly subjoin.

By order of the Committee,

C. F. ADAMS.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

In the year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-Three.

RESOLVES

Against the annexation of Texas to the Union.

Resolved, That under no circumstances whatsoever can the people of Massachusetts regard the proposition to admit Texas into the Union, in any other light than as dangerous to its continuance in peace, in prosperity, and in the enjoyment of those blessings which it is the object of a free government to secure.

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of Massachusetts, in the Congress of the United States, be requested to spare no exertions to oppose, and, if possible, to prevent the adoption of the proposition referred to.

Resolved, That His Excellency the Governor be requested to transmit one copy of these resolutions to the Executive of each of the United States, and a like copy to each Senator and Representative in Congress from Massachusetts.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Resolutions,

Passed at Westminster, Dec 2, 1842, at the Quarterly meeting of the Worcester County (North Division) Anti-Slavery Society.

Whereas, human constitutions and laws are but the expression of human will, which is never infallible nor always morally right; and whereas, the moral law of God is founded in the nature and constitution of things, is immutable, eternal and paramount to all human legislation; therefore

Resolved, That civil compacts or human laws can never, as such, be authoritative rules of faith or practice, and when they contravene divine laws must be regarded as treason against the government of God.

Whereas, the law of God says in positive and unequivocal terms, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant who is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place where he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best;' and we are further urged, 'Take counsel, execute judgment, to make our shadow as the night in the midst of the noonday, to hide the outcasts, to bewray not him that wandereth, to let the outcasts dwell with thee, and to be a covert to them from the face of the spoiler,' therefore

Resolved, That the clause in the Constitution of the United States, and the act of Congress of 1793, which require us to deliver up the flying fugitive into the hands of his blood-thirsty pursuers, are acts of hostility to the law of God and the rights of man, and are, therefore, null and void, and of no obligatory force whatever.

Resolved, That the union of the northern churches with the southern in church fellowship, the union of the northern States with the southern in one government, are unions which are cemented by the blood of the slave; unions which give perpetuity to his bonds; which wring his heart with the agony of despair, and which plunge him into the depths of intellectual and moral death.

Worcester County Anti-Slavery Meeting.

The Worcester County North Division Anti-Slavery Society held its annual meeting at Princeton, Feb. 1st, and was called to order by the President, Dea. J. T. Everett, at 11 o'clock, A. M. at the Baptist meeting-house.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Stone of Gardner.

On motion, a committee of five were appointed to prepare resolutions and report other business to the meeting, viz:

——Stone, Samuel Gay, T. P. Locke, Catherine Swan, and Abel Brown, were on the committee.

On motion, a committee of three, for the nomination of officers, were chosen, viz:

Albert C. Howe, George Miles, Joseph Raymond.

Mr. Kilburn of Princeton, addressed the meeting, during the absence of the business committee, giving an account of his recent observations of the 'peculiar institution,' while travelling South.

On motion,

Resolved, That persons present, or who may be present, be invited to participate in the discussions and take part in the proceedings of the Convention.

Rev. Mr. Stone from the business committee, presented the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the anti-slavery enterprise of our country is virtually and essentially a *Christian* enterprise, and is, therefore, imperative in its claims on the regard, sympathy and co-operation of the professedly christian churches of our land.

2. Resolved, That we recognize in Lewis Washington, (a fugitive from southern bondage,) present, a man, a brother, and welcome him into this State, solemnly pledging ourselves to extend to him our sympathy and protection, to save him from the oppressor's grasp.

3. Whereas, To emancipate slaves in the United States, is only to cease to rob them of their inalienable rights; such as—

1st. The right of their own bodies. 2d. The protection of good and wholesome laws. 3d. The compensation due for their laborious services. 4th. The privilege of giving testimony in civil and ecclesiastical courts. 5th. The rights of marriage. 6th. The privilege of education. 7th. Of the Bible and means of of salvation. Therefore,

4. Resolved, That we cannot recognize that man as a *Christian*, who does not give his influence to obtain the immediate emancipation of our brethren in bonds.

5. Resolved, That the existing prejudice, which excludes a portion of our colored citizens from equal privileges in our churches and public conveyances, is anti-christian, and cannot be tolerated for a moment by a Christian community.

Rev. Mr. Stone made some spirited remarks, with reference to the first resolution, and was followed by C. Swan, A. Brown, and T. P. Locke.

Adjourned to 1 1-2 o'clock, P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Met according to adjournment.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Samuel Gay.

Lewis Washington, (the fugitive slave) was called to the stand, as proof personal of the recognition contained in the second resolution. His remarks were characterised by native shrewdness, quickness of perception, and an expansiveness of thought and expression truly surprising in view of the soul-crushing system to which he had been subject.

Song, 'I am an abolitionist,' was sung in the spirit of freedom, by a young friend of the cause.

The resolution was farther discussed by Frederick Douglass, Charles Lenox Remond and William Jackson.

Rev. Abel Brown of the Vigilance Committee, Albany, N. Y. related several amusing incidents, having occurred within his own experience, to show, that the prejudice existing against persons of color is *not* on account of their *complexion* but *condition*.

EVENING SESSION.

Prayer was offered by T. P. Locke.

Song, 'God speed the right,' in a manner, that seemed to carry with it an assurance that God ever has, does, and will speed the right, in the cause of the oppressed, and sighing of the needy.

A committee consisting of Isaac Smith, Alfred Beman and George Miles, having been chosen to appoint the next time and place of meeting, reported the second Wednesday of March next, at Leominster. Report was accepted.

Albert C. Howe of the committee for the nomination of officers, presented the following report:

Joshua T. Everett, President. James Davenport, Joseph Raymond, Stillman Flint, George Kendall, Timothy F. Downe, Theodore P. Locke, Vice-Presidents. Catherine Swan, Corresponding Secretary. Benjamin Wyman, Recording Secretary. James M. Eveleth, Treasurer. Albert C. Howe, Auditor. Edward Kendall, Nathan Tolman, George Miles, John Mirick, Rev. Mr. Stone, Moses Smith, Henry Humphreys, Rev. Samuel Gay, Elisha A. Mirick and Benjamin Snow, Counsellors.

The report was unanimously adopted.

Frederick Douglass then addressed the audience, on various topics kindred to the cause.

The resolutions passed at the last quarterly meeting were read, and on motion,

Voted, That they be open for discussion, with those already before the meeting.

C. L. Remond spoke with reference to the second resolution of the last named series, alluding to the case of George Latimer, and showing by the light of anti-slavery truth, the true character of New England freedom for the slave. Mr. Remond was then requested by the President, to give an account of the treatment he received during his visit in Great Britain. He accordingly complied, describing the hospitality and kindness bestowed on him, with all the vividness of grateful recollection.

Song, 'Come join the abolitionists,' reverberated from opposite parts of the house, when 'every voice seemed an echo' to the call. Adjourned.

THURSDAY MORNING.

On motion, F. Douglass and C. L. Remond were added to the business committee.

F. Douglass introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the hands of the American church are full of blood, and that she is not, while she continues thus, what she assumes to be, the heaven-appointed instrumentality for reforming the world.

Mr. Douglass said, that the idea suggested in the resolution was not original with him, but was drawn from holy writ. He introduced the remarks, not because he liked to deal harshly with any, but because he believed it to be true, and the truth of which he would prove by facts of the most conclusive character. * * * * He also proved the instrumentality of the church in the support of this great evil, exhibiting the pit of slavery where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth; 'Rachel weeping for her children because they are not.' He pointed to the priest, who, with his deacons, (no allusion to Mr. President, of course, who he believed was a deacon,) but pro-slavery deacons, walking in the footsteps of their leader, (for how could they do otherwise and maintain their office?) on their way to the Sanhedrim, to the mountain, to discuss some new topic, or gain some new truth; and when passing, spread over this pit his pontifical robe. And the writer would add (by way of interpolation) that this institution was evermore esteemed sacred by virtue of his sacred office, to say nothing of this covering of light over darkness, in our American Aceldema.

On motion, T. P. Locke, Joseph Raymond and Isaach Smith were chosen a committee on finance.

Singing, during the interlude for business.

In a short time, the committee reported a subscription, rising fifty dollars.

C. L. Remond introduced the three following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the interests and honor of our country, humanity, justice and duty to our God, the progress and welfare of our race, demand a dissolution of the Union between northern liberty and southern slavery.

2. Resolved, That this Convention has no sympathy with the Third party, (so called,) and that we pledge our confidence and co-operation with the political principles of the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies.

3. Resolved, That, in consideration of the overwhelming and almost universal influences marshalled against us, yet cheered by the success of our past efforts, we recognise the duty of personal, earnest, self-denying exertions in behalf of the oppressed, and promise ourselves to remit *no effort* in our power, to hasten the hour of their emancipation.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Prayer was offered by Frederick Douglass.

C. L. Remond discussed the 1st resolution under consideration with reference to the dissolution of the Union, and sustained his remarks with great power and eloquence. He was followed by Frederick Douglass in his usual free and interesting style. Alluding to the recent anti-slavery gathering at Boston, he said liberty was seen sparkling from under the eye-brows of that Convention, [and we were glad to experience something of its radiating influence in the exhibition of anti-slavery truth amid the cold snows of Princeton.] He spoke of the progress of the cause, from William Lloyd Garrison single-handed with his paper, to the present time—with all its fresh accumulation of resources, remarking, that the *success* attending our enterprise had ever been in proportion to the *means* employed in accordance with the will of God. Adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

Rev. Mr. Cunningham, of Princeton, addressed the Throne of Grace.

The various resolutions were again discussed by F. Douglass, John Fay, Benj. Wyman, Nathan Danforth, C. L. Remond, John Merrick, Mr. Loring and J. T. Everett, and were adopted. Music was interspersed (during the remarks) with pleasing variety and effect, and at a late hour the Convention adjourned. BENJ. WYMAN, *Rec. Sec.*

C. SWAN, *Cor. Sec.*

Mobocracy in Western New-York.

LITTLE FALLS, Herkimer Co. }
Feb. 17, 1843. }

W. L. GARRISON:

DEAR SIR—The Anti-Slavery Society of central New-York are now holding a Convention in this place. It commenced on Wednesday morning. A most glorious time we have had. This is professedly a democratic county, and from what I have witnessed, I think the soil first rate for abolition seed. The true-hearted yeomanry poured into the Convention from the hills and vallies, giving a hearty response to the call. The Convention was organized, and went on quietly and in order during the day. In the evening, there were some riotous indications, which, however, did not break out to disturb the meeting much. Full liberty of speech and to vote was given to all. A resolution, condemning the course of Governor Bouck, in that part of his message relating to the 'Virginia question,' and the 'Jury-trial bill,' was under discussion, which made no small stir among the demagogues and office-holders under him. The resolution was passed by an overwhelming majority, after being fully discussed on both sides. On Thursday, the larger hall was full, and the business of the Convention went on with spirit and animation, throughout the day; but, in the evening, the scenes of the Utica Convention were acted over again, with this exception—the mob was headed by a Judge and other office-holders, instead of the *Priests* and *Editors*.

I never saw a rabble more clearly identified with their leaders than this. They responded to the appeals of the Judge and his associates, even to the *barking like dogs*. Their conduct was what might have been expected from the low and vulgar appeals made to their passions by their leaders, and resulted in breaking up the deliberations of the Convention, the trampling of freedom of speech under their feet, and the destruction of some twenty settees. The conduct of the leaders of the rioters is properly appreciated by all whose good opinion is of any value, whether abolitionists or not, and the Judge and his associates have all the glory of arousing the spirit of mobacracy, and carrying on the war.

On Friday morning, the Convention assembled again, finished all their business, and closed their services, in a most happy spirit of love and unity, and devotion to the cause of anti-slavery, and parted to return to their homes, greatly strengthened to do all in their power to 'help the cause along,' until 'slavery is no more.'

Yours, in the bonds of humanity,

F. WRIGHT.

From the Baltimore American of Friday.

Terrible Calamity!

DESTRUCTION OF POINT PETRE, GAUDALOUPE—SEVERAL THOUSAND LIVES LOST! Capt. Thompson, of brig Frances Jane, at this port yesterday from St. Johns, reports the occurrence of an earthquake at that place on the 8th Feb. which did no especial damage. In St. Thomas it was very severe, and lasted over two minutes, but no one was hurt. In Nevis every thing except the bath-house is said to be down—and the steamer passing Martinique, Guadaloupe and Montserrat, saw those islands covered with a dense cloud of smoke.

ST. JOHNS, P. R. Feb 15.

We yesterday received advices from the windward. The effects of the earthquake of the 8th have been awful indeed. The town of Point Petre, Guadaloupe, is entirely destroyed, and *ten thousand persons are supposed to have been killed.* At Antigua there has been a great loss of property, but few lives destroyed. The sugar works are injured, and the greater part of the crop will be lost. Montserrat, Barbadoes, &c. are said to have suffered much—particulars not yet known.

☞ Here we have another choice specimen of the consistency of Liberty party abolitionists.

☞ We are heartily glad to learn that the 'Liberty party,' so called, who last year ran a separate candidate for Counsellor in this district, and so defeated a choice by the people, resolved unanimously at the Counsellor meeting at South Marlow last week, to support ALVAH SMITH, Esq., the whig candidate for Counsellor. This ensures Mr. Smith's election, and so far as his influence in the council can go, consistent with the integrity of the Union, no whig can object to him as the open and avowed enemy of slavery.—*Keene, N. H. Sentinel.*

THE LIBERATOR

BOSTON:

FRIDAY MORNING, MARCH 10, 1843.

☞ A REPEAL OF THE UNION BETWEEN NORTHERN LIBERTY AND SOUTHERN SLAVERY IS ESSENTIAL TO THE ABOLITION OF THE ONE, AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE OTHER. ☜

The Intermarriage Law.

Another characteristic article, in relation to this law, from the pen of NATHAN HALE, editor of the Daily Advertiser, we have placed in its proper department—the 'Refuge of Oppression.'

The merited castigation that we bestowed upon this 'respectable' enemy of human rights, in the Liberator of the 24th ultimo, has greatly shocked the tender sensibilities of the penny editor of the Daily Times, who pronounces it 'a furious and gross attack'—'a malignant and venomous attack'—'an impotent and worthless attack,' by 'a libellous and foul-mouthed assailant,' 'a dirty libeller, who revels in congenial filth,' &c. &c. He gives Mr. Hale a certificate of character, as 'a public journalist of most enviable reputation,' who 'has invariably pursued a course calculated to sustain the honor of the press most nobly,' than whom 'no man is held in higher estimation by his contemporaries,' and 'who has honestly labored to promote the welfare of society.'

Having thus come to the defence of Mr. Hale, and endorsed all that he has written in contempt of the free colored inhabitants of this Commonwealth, and in opposition to the anti-slavery movement, the editor of the Times will understand that the article which has so ruffled his composure is now applied by us as emphatically to himself as to Mr. Hale.

His assertion that Mr. Hale is 'a most respected member of the city press,' and that our animadversions on the course of the Advertiser are nothing but 'ribaldry, falsehood and folly,' is mere wind. Let him, if he dare, copy what we have written into the Times, that his readers may see on what grounds we have administered severe chastisement to Mr. Hale; and if he can then convince them that our article is 'infamous,' we will cheerfully submit to their censure.

We will now turn to the editorial article from the Advertiser, on our first page, respecting the Intermarriage Law. It is as replete with proud inhumanity and polished villany as the English language can make it.

Mr. Hale says—'The ground on which most members have been inclined to pass the law is, that they believe the prohibition of the present law is inoperative.' This, if true, is certainly a poor compliment to their sense of justice, and their regard for equal rights; for the only just 'ground' for the repeal of the law is, not that it is 'inoperative,' but that it is palpably ridiculous, grossly iniquitous, and positively unconstitutional. But Mr. Hale is extremely happy to inform them, that the law has not been a dead letter, and 'that the knowledge that such alliances are illegal in this State has prevented their being contracted.' We challenge him to name a single case to sustain his confident assertion. But, allowing his assertion to be true, what is his argument? Simply this—that because a tyrannical and an immoral enactment accomplishes its purpose, its successful enforcement furnishes a sound reason for its perpetuity! In nearly every slaveholding State, there is a law prohibiting the emancipation of slaves, except on condition of their expatriation. This law is not 'inoperative'—therefore, (according to the logic of Mr. Hale,) it ought never to be repealed. And so of every other atrocious law that may be in successful operation.

It seems to us that he falls very little short of being either a fool or a knave, who contends that the Legislature of this Commonwealth has either a constitutional or a moral right to determine how white or how black in complexion shall be the parties seeking to be united in wedlock. From what source, human or divine, does it derive its authority for this extraordinary legislation, and to become a general inspector of skins? Why may it not decree that intermarriage shall not be allowed between persons of American and French, American and Irish, American and Dutch descent, as well as between those of American and African descent? Are human rights in this Commonwealth to be dependant on the matrimonial *taste* of the Legislature? Are Cupid and Hymen under the lawful supervision and control of that body? Must human affection and love be confined to the channels marked out for them by the hand of human legislation? Monstrous absurdities! Yet of these absurdities has the legislature of Massachusetts been guilty ever since the adoption of her Constitution.

Let us suppose a case. It is possible, (laugh as the vulgar-minded may at the supposition,) that the strongest attachment may subsist between persons of white and black complexions—so strong as to induce them to wish to be united in wedlock. Nay, Mr. Hale affirms that there have been already such instances, but that the law has interposed an insurmountable barrier to the connexion. If they shall venture to marry, they know that their marriage will be authoritatively declared null and void, and their offspring illegitimate. Deterred by the penalties of such an act, they remain separated through life. Who can measure the amount of anguish and misery thus inflicted on the parties so tenderly attached to each other? In this particular, their freedom is a mockery—they have no rights—they are impotent as chattels personal—they are severely punished for no crime, and degraded before all the world; and a most flagrant insult is offered to Almighty God, because on him lies the responsibility of having given them different complexions.

'Wo, wo to those who trample on the mind,
A deathless thing! They know not what they do,
Or what they deal with!'

Or suppose that, in defiance of the law, the parties marry. Of course, (for the law is not inoperative, exultingly says Nathan Hale,) they are visited with all the pains and penalties of the statute, and held up to infamy, for doing that which is perfectly lawful and well-pleasing in the sight of God! 'A stigma,' says Mr. Hale, 'is affixed by the law to such an alliance, sufficient in most cases to prevent it.' A stigma! Shame!

'Skins may differ, but affection
Dwells in white and black the same.'

'Whom *God* hath joined together, let not *man* put asunder.'

With consummate hardihood, the editor of the Advertiser asks—'How is it a greater hardship to the offspring of parents of different colors to be subjected to the penalties of illegitimacy, than to those of any other unmarried parents?' But is it no hardship to degrade virtuous persons, who have taken on their lips the sacred vows of marriage, to a level with those who have no reverence for the marriage institution, and who are living in a state of profligacy? Is not this to confound all moral distinctions, and to put darkness for light? The laws which afflict and degrade the offspring on account of the guilt of their parents, or for any cause whatever, are worthy of the dark ages. They who are illegitimate of birth are not to blame for that over which they had no control, and respecting which they had no choice; and to punish them for the sins of others is monstrous inhumanity. But mark how exquisite is the moral sense, and how impartial the judgment, of the editor of the Advertiser! The law pronounces children born out of wedlock to be illegitimate; therefore, it does right in declaring children born in wedlock also to be illegitimate! The 'hardship,' he says, is no greater in the one case than in the other; nay, the cases are parallel!

Again, he says—'The misfortune of these persons [children] is severe enough, it is true, in owing their existence to so *unnaturally assorted* parents.' If we were to exclaim, 'The blackguard!' we should unquestionably again disturb the composure of the editor of the Times, and cause him to blow a yet louder strain through his penny trumpet; for men and things are not to be called by their right names, where respectability is in the case. Nevertheless, we will try to be no respecter of persons; and to treat with prejudice and ruffian pride as they deserve, come from what quarter they may. This fling, 'unnaturally assorted parents,' is indicative of a state of mind equally foolish and abusive, equally indecent and low. Where is there 'unnatural' in the complexion of the human race? At what particular shade does the skin become 'unnatural,' and worthy of punishment by law? Can Nathan Hale tell us where his line of demarcation begins, and where it ends? For it must be remembered that, among our colored population, there is every variety of complexion; that there are many colored persons much whiter than many white persons, and many white persons who are much darker than many colored persons. It is no more 'unnatural' for white and colored persons to intermarry, than it is for tall and short, fat and lean persons; and any attempt to make any invidious distinction in such cases, either by way of classification or legislation, is an insult to the good sense of mankind. The editor of the Advertiser, having debased his own nature by hateful prejudice and false pride, is blind in an 'unnatural' state, which accounts for his illogic, ridiculous philosophy, and proscriptive spirit. When he taunts persons created in the same divine image, though widely differing in complexion, of being 'unnaturally assorted,' if found united together by the ties of wedlock, he must not complain if he receive the treatment that is due to a profane scoffer. There is nothing 'unnatural,' in all this controversy, but the prejudice which exists in this country against the colored race—a prejudice which is not founded in complexion, but condition—a prejudice which is unknown from slavery alone—a prejudice which is unknown in all Europe, and can be found on no other than a slaveholding soil.

Mr. Hale argues in favor of the intermarriage law on the ground that the children of a mixed marriage cannot now 'associate, on terms of intimacy and equality, with persons of the same race with either father or mother.' And he adds—'It is idle to say, that are not and *never will be so received.*' This is another specimen of his humanity and morality. It is idle to say, that the unholy spirit of caste ought to be done away—is it? Those whose skins are 'not colored like our own' will never be received on terms of intimacy and equality—will they not? We can tell Mr. Hale that the year 1843 is not the completion of time, and that his standard of action is not to be the rule of all coming ages. It will take but a very few years to prove him a false prophet. If his blindness were not equal to his malevolence, he would see that an astonishing change has already been wrought in public opinion, in a comparatively short time, on the subject of prejudice; a change that warrants the belief, that the day is not far distant when all conventional distinctions shall cease, and when the past and present persecution of our colored population, on account of the hue of their skin, will be classed with the hanging of the witches, the whipping of the Quakers, and the banishment of the Baptists, in 'the olden times.'

With regard to his assertion about 'the degradation of the species, and the shortening of the duration of life, by the unnatural mixture of the two races,' we have only to say, that it is wholly unsupported by any well-authenticated facts; that there is nothing unnatural in the mixture, and therefore such a consequence cannot follow; that it is notorious, in all slaveholding regions, that persons of a mixed blood are the most promising portion of the population; and that the witnesses to which he obscurely refers, in confirmation of his absurd theory, are persons whose testimony is not to be received, because they are confessedly among those who regard and treat the colored race as inferior to the white. To say that 'God has forbidden by the most emphatic sanction,' the intermarriage of white and colored persons, is to assert what neither the statute of death to the private revenge (!) of a jealous husband, does not teach, nor revelation declare. It is the impudent utterance of a lie, *for a most contemptible purpose.*

But, further. 'This effort to reform the law,' says Mr. Hale, 'has not its origin in the wishes of the blacks.' This is to affirm that they wish to be degraded, and do not aspire to the rank of equal beings. Just as the slaveholding ruffians declare, that the slaves are contented and happy, and that the movement for their emancipation did not originate with the consequence who originated 'the effort to reform the law.' The only pertinent question is,—Is the law just or unjust—right or wrong—honorable or dishonorable? It is a foul stain on the statute book of the Commonwealth, and for that reason it should be obliterated, no matter what may be the wishes or opinion of 'the blacks' in relation to it. It is true, they have not made themselves conspicuous in seeking the repeal of the law, because they have not deemed it best to subject themselves to mis

of the people, irrespective of color or condi-
'It is not to be supposed,' continues this 're-
ible ruler, 'that the number of *colored gentle-*
who are of a marriageable age, has been doubled
State, as is shown by the census, by emigra-
n within ten years, for nothing.' If this be any
better than low blackguardism, we are unable
prehend it. They whom he sneeringly calls
ored gentlemen' from the South, are in most
the most liberated captives who have escaped
the prison-house of bondage, and who, thank
are permitted to inhale the air of liberty on our
very much to the regret of Nathan Hale. To
ent them as running to this Commonwealth, in
obtain white wives, is cruel as a stroke of
and senseless as a piece of wit. As an *argu-*
gainst the repeal of the intermarriage law, it is
contempt.

editor of the Advertiser is apprehensive, should
repeal take place, that there are 'some few de-
females' (white or colored?) who would soon
an unequivocal proof of their approbation of it,'
monial demonstration. This, indeed, con-
his 'most serious objection' to the proposed
If he would only attend to his own concerns,
to meddle with those of other people, he would
himself much more comfortable, and much
ious, than he is at present.

Capital Punishment.

ave, once more, to the recent discussion on
ject, in the Broadway Tabernacle, New-York,
ween the Rev. George B. Cheever and Mr. O'Sul-

have already stated that Mr Cheever finds but
passage in the Bible, on which to build his argu-
in favor of capital punishment. (Gen. ix. 6.)
ing that his interpretation of that passage is a
—that the law 'which he finds in it was
to all mankind, and that it was not modified by
ious dispensation, and is not repealed by any
Christianity—he proceeds to draw his infer-
and to make his assertions, with all possible
and assurance. His premises are feebly
, but his conclusions are formed with re-
vigor. Having satisfied his own mind, that
ld have 'put on Christ,' and whose weapons
are carnal,' not only may, but are solemnly
to put to death the man slayer, he runs through
mazes of metaphorical confusion' to find
and figures to illustrate the humanity, benevo-
justice, and moral efficacy of the gallows; and
ght, in bold relief, the cruelty, fanaticism and
of those who are for abolishing that instru-
of judicial murder. We look, in vain, for any
his long and elaborate argument that com-
with the teachings, example or spirit of Christ;
exhibits a soul lifted above the fear of those
can kill the body only; or that inculcates the
and duty of laying down our lives for our ene-
unresistingly, whenever they murderously seek
ction; or that evinces the possession, on his
of that 'faith which overcomes the world.' On
trary, we find much that is indicative of moral
ce and selfish regard, and a Shylock disposi-
claim the pound of flesh, even to the shedding
We find a readiness to use the pistol, the
knife, or the rifle, as well as the gallows, in
defence,' and, in the absence of what is called
ment, a justification for carrying deadly wea-
so that the person, in order to be prepared to re-
any insult, and redress any wrong. To be thus
and equipped,' he affirms, is to exhibit a
like demeanor toward enemies!! Hear him:

posed now to prove more fully the injustice
immorality of the effort for the abolition of this
You are unjust, if you do not give to socie-
some means of self-defence against assassins,
they relinquish for the protection of the gov-
Men do not wear arms—but why? Be-
of the solemn assurance that the government
protect life in the same way, if need be, in which
ans of death protect it.' * * * 'The truth
here is no alternative between the benevolence of
ntate of death to the murderer,' and the violence
vate revenge (!) One or the other society will
and if they throw off the protection of the one,
must endure the misery of the other. This pro-
power must be lodged in the government, with
ency of its execution, *or men must go armed*,
we must protect ourselves, and our neighbors too,
the murderer as we can' (!!)

ms it is assumed that men have a right to wear
and must do so when the government fails to
them protection. This we deny, in the name of
It is the doctrine of ruffians, pirates, and men
where, the world over. Nothing like it can be
in Christianity. And here let it be remembered,
question is not, whether even a despotic gov-
must be not preferable to anarchy, or the common
worse than lynch law; but it is, whether, *as fol-*
ers of Christ and members of his body, we are au-
, or can cherish the wish, to put even assas-
death—to break men's necks on the gallows
any crime whatever—to take life for life. A
ge in his phraseology will show the absur-
Mr. Cheever's reasoning. '*Christians* do not
arms—but why?' Because they have entrusted
ment with the 'weapons of death' to protect
Is it so? Is this not to fear those who
the body—not to count their lives dear unto
to be willing to lose their lives for Christ's
What! *Christians* to be armed with bowie-
, pistols and daggers—and these to constitute,
the weapons of their warfare'—and these to
ed on for protection! Surely, the man who in-
these abominable sentiments knows not what
is of. 'He that loveth his life shall lose it;'
is every one who puts his trust for safety and
in 'weapons of death.' But here is another
ordinary specimen of christian ethics, from the
of the 'wolf in sheep's clothing'—for such we
constrained to regard him, in view of his profes-
a minister of Him who prayed, even in the
of a terrible death, for the forgiveness of his

The law of Christ confirms this statute, [life for
and I repeat my assertion, that it is repromul-
under the form of Love in the gospel (!) It is
ly assumed that men have a right to wear
and must do so when the government fails to
them protection. This we deny, in the name of
It is the doctrine of ruffians, pirates, and men
where, the world over. Nothing like it can be
in Christianity. And here let it be remembered,
question is not, whether even a despotic gov-
must be not preferable to anarchy, or the common
worse than lynch law; but it is, whether, *as fol-*
ers of Christ and members of his body, we are au-
, or can cherish the wish, to put even assas-
death—to break men's necks on the gallows
any crime whatever—to take life for life. A
ge in his phraseology will show the absur-
Mr. Cheever's reasoning. '*Christians* do not
arms—but why?' Because they have entrusted
ment with the 'weapons of death' to protect
Is it so? Is this not to fear those who
the body—not to count their lives dear unto
to be willing to lose their lives for Christ's
What! *Christians* to be armed with bowie-
, pistols and daggers—and these to constitute,
the weapons of their warfare'—and these to
ed on for protection! Surely, the man who in-
these abominable sentiments knows not what
is of. 'He that loveth his life shall lose it;'
is every one who puts his trust for safety and
in 'weapons of death.' But here is another
ordinary specimen of christian ethics, from the
of the 'wolf in sheep's clothing'—for such we
constrained to regard him, in view of his profes-
a minister of Him who prayed, even in the
of a terrible death, for the forgiveness of his

The law of Christ confirms this statute, [life for
and I repeat my assertion, that it is repromul-
under the form of Love in the gospel (!) It is
ly assumed that men have a right to wear
and must do so when the government fails to
them protection. This we deny, in the name of
It is the doctrine of ruffians, pirates, and men
where, the world over. Nothing like it can be
in Christianity. And here let it be remembered,
question is not, whether even a despotic gov-
must be not preferable to anarchy, or the common
worse than lynch law; but it is, whether, *as fol-*
ers of Christ and members of his body, we are au-
, or can cherish the wish, to put even assas-
death—to break men's necks on the gallows
any crime whatever—to take life for life. A
ge in his phraseology will show the absur-
Mr. Cheever's reasoning. '*Christians* do not
arms—but why?' Because they have entrusted
ment with the 'weapons of death' to protect
Is it so? Is this not to fear those who
the body—not to count their lives dear unto
to be willing to lose their lives for Christ's
What! *Christians* to be armed with bowie-
, pistols and daggers—and these to constitute,
the weapons of their warfare'—and these to
ed on for protection! Surely, the man who in-
these abominable sentiments knows not what
is of. 'He that loveth his life shall lose it;'
is every one who puts his trust for safety and
in 'weapons of death.' But here is another
ordinary specimen of christian ethics, from the
of the 'wolf in sheep's clothing'—for such we
constrained to regard him, in view of his profes-
a minister of Him who prayed, even in the
of a terrible death, for the forgiveness of his

The law of Christ confirms this statute, [life for
and I repeat my assertion, that it is repromul-
under the form of Love in the gospel (!) It is

argues precisely in the same manner as do all men of violence, and will find warm supporters among desperadoes of every description; but every one who is born of God knows that he bears false witness against Christianity, and slanders a crucified Saviour. From the rule, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' Mr. Cheever deduces the right to carry deadly weapons, to erect the gallows, and to take life! From the same rule, Bishop Hedding deduces the right of one man to enslave his fellow-man, and to make merchandize of the image of God!

'This law,' says Mr. Cheever, 'is as obligatory as any statute in the decalogue. Its authority, like that of the decalogue, is demonstrable, because *the precept is a moral duty*. It is just as demonstrable as the authority of the principle, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' But how can commands, which expressly conflict with each other, be equally obligatory as moral duties? The sixth commandment of the decalogue reads—'*Thou shalt not kill*.' The 'Noachic precept,' as Mr. C. learnedly terms it, and argues from it, authorizes one man, in certain cases and under certain circumstances, to kill another. Here the two are brought into collision with each other; and we put it to the *theological* and *scholastic* ingenuity of Mr. Cheever to reconcile them, if he can. Will he say that the sixth commandment was intended to control the conduct of the private individual, but not to apply to governmental bodies? But are not these composed of individuals, who can never divest themselves of their moral obligation? To which of the other commands in the decalogue does he allow a similar exception to be made? If an individual may not, may 'the powers that be,' commit adultery, or steal, or bear false witness, or covet, or take the name of the Lord in vain, or make any graven images, or have other gods than Jehovah, under any circumstances? Can the Moral Governor of the universe authorise and require a violation of the moral precepts of the decalogue by any judicial or legislative body of men? If he can in the sixth, can he not in the first, second, third, seventh, &c. &c.? Or is it not to 'kill' a man, by breaking his neck on the gallows? If every individual in the world is expressly forbidden to take the life of his fellow-man, how can he do so with others, collectively, (any more than to steal or commit adultery,) without violating a moral precept?

One man kills another, and in order to put a check on man-killing, certain other persons (called a government) kill him; a second commits adultery, and those same persons, to prevent the spreading of licentiousness, imitate his example; a third is an idolator, and again those very individuals, to make idolatry odious, follow in the footsteps of their idolatrous predecessor! We would respectfully ask Mr. Cheever, is this THE MORAL LAW, or in accordance with it? May an exception be made in one case, and not in the other? On this point we do not wish to be tenacious, but we are anxious for more light, because Mr. Cheever expressly says—'What it may be wrong for you to do as a private individual, it may be wrong for you *not* to do as a citizen, or an officer of justice'! By the word 'wrong' here, he means, of course, *morally* wrong. The logic and morality of the argument, then, run thus:—As a private individual, it would be morally wrong for you to take human life; but, as a citizen, or an officer of justice, it may be morally wrong for you not to take human life! As a private individual, it would be morally wrong for you to act the part of an adulterer; but, as a citizen, or an officer of justice, (for, 'that alters the case' vastly!) it may be morally wrong for you to refuse to be an adulterer! Here is a new inducement for office-hunting rogues and profligates to seek relief from those hateful moral responsibilities which rest on them as 'private individuals'!

'We have,' says Mr. Cheever, 'the unanimous concurrence and practice of the whole ancient world to sustain our interpretation of the Noachic ordinance.' Yes, and in the benighted condition and awful fate of 'the whole ancient world,' you also have the clearest evidence that they were 'in the gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity.' They took the sword, and perished by the sword.

The only allusion which this professed disciple of Christ makes to the teachings and example of his Master is in the following words:

'You find at the period of our Saviour's abode in Judea, a great abuse of the whole law, with all its penalties, for the purposes of private revenge. Does the present Law-giver abrogate this statute? No! He condemns most severely the *spirit of revenge*, but *confirms* the law, and corrects the mistakes of any who supposed he would destroy it. 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law [to hang criminals!!] or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' [What! to act in the capacity of a hangman?]

Here are several positive assertions, but, unfortunately for Mr. C's gallows-argument, not one of them happens to be true, as any one may see at a glance on reading Christ's sermon on the mount.

It is not true that Christ alluded to any abuses of the law of retaliation. It is not true that he referred to cases of private revenge. It is not true that he used severe language in discoursing on this particular topic. It is not true that, in referring to 'the law and the prophets,' he meant either the Noachic or the Levitical law of capital punishment.

When he said, 'Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery,' did he allude only to the abuses of the command, or to the command itself? When he also said, 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' did he not expressly refer, 'word for word, comma for comma,' to that part of the judicial code of Moses, as expressed in Exodus xxi. 23, 24, 25? And in abrogating it, did he not lay the axe at the root of the tree of retaliation, both as a whole and in all its branches? Let his illustrious life, let his glorious death answer!

'I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' Such was the imperative language of Jesus to his disciples. Now for a literary, scholastic, theological, priestly interpretation of his words, to show that they had no meaning! 'Turn to him the other also'—that is, as 'a private individual'; but, as 'a citizen, or an officer of justice,' knock him down! 'If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also'—that is, as 'a private individual'; but, as 'a citizen, or an officer of justice,' hunt him from house to house, from street to street, from city to city, in order to recover thy coat and ensure his imprisonment! 'That ye resist not evil'—that is, as 'a private individual'; but, as 'a citizen, or an officer of justice,' you may resist with bludgeons, dirks, bowie knives, pistols, or any other deadly weapons that may be necessary!

We shall probably have occasion to examine this *formidable* argument, in some other particulars, in a future number.

Letter of Joseph Barker.

Accompanying the excellent letter from this respected individual, which we have placed on our last page, we received a note from Elizabeth Pease, of Darlington, in which she says,—'I feel assured that such an expression of interest in those great and leading reforms of the age, in which thou art acting so important a part, cannot fail to be acceptable to thee. His [J. B's] name is already known to thee, through the various tracts and periodicals which I have sent to thyself and other friends in America; and I am sure they will form his best introduction to thee and to thy readers—distinguished as they are by the evidences of an honest, investigating, and truly christian spirit, and rare freedom of thought.'

REPEAL OF THE INTERMARRIAGE LAW. The bill for the repeal of this law has passed both houses of the Legislature, and received the signature of Gov. Morton. It is a most signal victory over prejudice and the spirit of caste.

☞ The Convention appointed for South Woburn on Saturday next, will be held in Stoneham.

FROM OUR ENGLISH CORRESPONDENT.

State of Things in England.

MUSWELL HILL, (near London,) Jan. 27, 1843.

To the Editor of the Liberator.

DEAR SIR:

You know, though you will have occasion to be reminded of it, because you don't suffer under it, that our law-makers, who represent themselves and a few of their class only, have recently imposed an income tax of 3 per cent. upon the whole people, excepting those whose income is below £150 per annum. This screw is just beginning to work. It touches, and it is fortunate that it touches, fish that can scream, that is, those who have votes, and they are beginning to scream beyond all sympathy. By the way, had it not occurred to you that the reason old Izaack Walton, with his treatise upon the best way of impaling worms alive, and entombing hooks in throats of fish, has ever passed as a human religious old gossip has been, because fish can't scream; they are, as your black population were, voiceless, until you undertake to screw for them, and to teach them how to screw for themselves.

To quit old Izaack and his armory of funny hooks and barbs, and return—this income tax is making them scream most enormously; I was at first about to write piteously, but they don't deserve pity. They are just the class who have ever shouted for war and bloodshed, and cared not for the misery inflicted upon any nation, so that the brutal destructiveness for which this country has ever been known, ended in its trained slaves, the army and navy, inflicting the greater amount of misery upon men they know not.

Our representative system gives one man in eight a vote, and is so arranged, that five out of every eight who vote can be influenced to vote as the Squirearchy, or the persons of the established Church, or the Peers of the neighbourhood may desire

The income tax was not imposed until all other sources of taxation had been exhausted. Labor in England bears and pays 17-20ths of the whole taxation. The people starve, and the law-makers, that is, the aristocracy, tax; and when they could tax corn seed, cattle and fruit, and those articles which the poor use more particularly no longer, then they were driven for a time to tax a class who can make a noise, and when properly waked up, can make themselves heard in what is called the House of Commons, though elected by the influence of the aristocracy.

When I say they could tax articles of consumption no longer, don't understand me as meaning that they could not pass the law. They could pass any thing; law-making is a disease with them—but they found it useless to impose heavy duties, because the smugglers stepped in and laughed at them.

It was found, many years ago in England, utterly impossible in the silk trade to sustain a duty above 15 per cent.; whenever they did, the great teacher of stupid statesmen, the smuggler, interposed, and introduced the taxed or prohibited article at an insurance of 10 per cent. For instance, when bandanna handkerchiefs were prohibited in England, it was a common thing to find one in most gentlemen's pockets, and until the heavy duties which were imposed upon ribbons and the French silk manufacture were greatly reduced, traders in England used to purchase in France without reference to the English duty, and paying 10 per cent. to the French house. The latter guaranteed the safe delivery into the shop of the English trader.

They could afford to lose a shipment, every now and then, to the revenue cruisers; so now with reference to our fiscal laws, it is found that a high duty does not produce so much as a moderate duty, and they reduce their scale, not of choice, but of necessity.

Your statesmen will find this out in time. Knowledge travels slowly with statesmen—it is wonderful with what little stock in trade this class set up. Oxensteirn, if he lived now, need not tell his son to remark with what little wisdom in statesmen the world is governed, for the world has opened its eyes to this, and is pondering in all countries upon the question of loosing the girths to the saddle, shortening and cutting the spurs of the riders, and in some instances of pitching them off.

Thanks to some friend in your good city, I received the numbers of the Latimer Journal, and have been able thereby to participate more fully in the steps taken to rescue that poor creature from the sharks.

You are certainly better off as to representation, and the source from whence the laws proceed, than we are. Democracy, bad as it is, is trifling when its sudden and fitful outbreaks are compared with the steady, continuous, oppressive and suppressive legislation of our aristocracy, i. e. when, as in England, they, in virtue of their position, and the feudal system which spawned them upon us, held the great proportion of the land of the kingdom, and the appointment of a parson in every parish, to suck up a tenth, not of the *increase*, mind, but of the *produce* of the land.

Then add the power to influence the choice of the majority of those who are to make the laws, and who of course make such laws as suit the class, and the class only, and over whose proposed laws they have also a negative voice, as a separate branch of the legislature. In addition to this, they have so managed as that practically they have the appointment in their own hands of all the administrators of the laws in the kingdom, from the Lord Chancellor, who is our highest legal functionary, downward. He is generally the cleverest lawyer among the party who hold the government for the time being, and his business is to appoint to office the highest of our other legal functionaries. These he is guided to select from amongst those who have served the party, and can be relied on to laud the system as it is, i. e. the government by an aristocracy, and in particular that section of the grass-poppers who happen then to be in possession of the herbage.

Our country is divided into counties, and to each of those counties there is what is called a Lord Lieutenant, selected from one of the class. He has the nomination of all the magistrates for his county. Now and then a name or two may be added in addition to those whom he nominates, but this is seldom, and in effect he has the appointment from amongst the landed Squirearchy of all the magistrates—it is considered a part of his legitimate influence. It is not usual to nominate any who have not a considerable landed possession, for this would go to enlarge the circle; nor as a rule any who have not had their landed possessions in the county for some time, for this would admit *parvenues*, nor then, if they happen to be dissenters from the established sect; and as that sect has a parson or two compulsorily maintained by the people in every parish, whose business it is to note the well affected, that is, those who go to the church, a pretty correct surveillance is maintained, and the slave spirit and the sectional interest are kept up and perpetuated. It would be difficult to give you an adequate idea of the perfect system of oppression which our statute book, enacted by this class, and this class only, presents, when it is examined for laws against the poor, and contrasted with those against the rich.

Allowing for the difference of the two systems of slavery which prevail in the United States and in England, in the one personal and avowed and direct, and in the other disavowed and indirect, but as certain in subduing the slave class, the laws are the same in England, in their effect, as those which you make against the black population. Your laws are openly tyrannical—ours circuitous in language, but as tyrannical in spirit and as certain in effect.

I feel I must give you an instance—it will be one which you great boasters of liberty, whose land is not used up to the extent which it is in England, will be able readily to appreciate, because it is about land. Had it been about man, I should have deemed it necessary to ask his color, before I should have pronounced an American competent as a juryman.

In England, that which most needs protection,—liberty, the only wealth of the poor,—gets least; and property, which needs the least, as it possesses a protesting power in itself, gets the most. Let it not be supposed that I would imply that property ought not to be held sacred—it ought. It is as essential to the poor that the fruits of his labor should be secured to him, as to the rich that their superabundance should be made safe to them. But liberty is still more valuable to all, to the poor in particular, for it is their only wealth; the power to labor is dependant upon it, and ought therefore to be, and with just legislation would be, in the case of the poor, the more sacred; and a just, deliberate, cool, and therefore probably a reasonable administration of it, and considerate administrators would be secured.

Americans who have been used to yield credance to the clap-trap sayings about the equal laws of old England, will hardly believe, that in England, to injure a tree, sapling or shrub, in a rich man's park, to the extent of twenty shillings, subjects an Englishman to the punishment of a felon, to transportation; but that an injury to any root or plant in a garden, though to the same amount, is imprisonment, *or payment for the injury, and £20 only*. The park and the tree belong to the rich man, the garden and the root to the poor man. A rich oppressor may now, in England, by law, destroy a poor man's garden, and every root, and pay the amount and £20, and if a poor man were in return to injure his oppressor's tree, sapling or shrub in the park, (we quote the words of the act,) he is transported from his country for seven years, nominally, but, as every one knows, that, to a poor man, is in effect for life, and if the poor wife, under those circumstances, should, though able to maintain herself, not be able to maintain her children, she may, by law, be committed to the workhouse, under the recent poor law act, which is the same thing as sending the poor creature to jail, and that for no fault of her own, but because her husband committed a trespass.

At the very same moment, the two men, the rich man and the poor man, being tried on the same day, at the same assizes, for the same offence, in the presence of their respective neighbors and friends, this by law would be the different results to these two Englishmen: the rich man paying £20 and the damage done to the garden, would sit down on the same bench with his brother 'squires, whilst by those same 'squires the poor man would be transported as a felon.

The Americans would perhaps doubt this, if I did not give them chapter and verse. I refer them, therefore, to the 7 and 8 Geo. 4, c. 30, s. 19, and to the 21st section of the same act.

By whom was this law introduced? By Sir Robert Peel and the Squirearchy, the 'country gentlemen' par excellence, the park owners; and all the tribe of the aristocrats shouted, Behold a Solon, a Lycurgus is here! If Diogenes had been there, could he have found a thinking man amongst the assembly calling themselves the assembly of the first gentlemen in England. Just men they are not.

E. SEARCH.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

Letters from David L. Child.

WASHINGTON, March 4, 1843.

Since my last, Mr. Adams has proposed four sets of resolutions, each of an interesting character. The first set related to the annexation of Texas. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he reported on the Alabama resolutions for, and sundry remonstrances against the measure, that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject. As an individual member, he offered resolutions to the effect, 1st, That there is no power in this government to annex to this Union any foreign nation. 2d. That any attempt to annex Texas, either by act of Congress, or treaty, would be a violation of the Constitution, null and void, and that the people of the free States ought not to submit to it. As soon as the resolutions were read, the South was on its legs objecting loudly to the reception, and they were not received.

Another set related to *repudiation*. Mr. Adams had before expressed his views briefly, that it was the duty of the United States to come to the aid and relief of the States in some form, under their present embarrassments; and, referring to a letter of Gov. McNutt of Mississippi, in which the belief is expressed that foreign governments will enforce the claims of their citizens by war, and that Mississippi would go to war sooner than pay her bonds—Mr. Adams asked what would the United States do if it came to that. Would they see a State conquered? He inferred that if it would be the duty of the United States to defend a repudiating State in case of a war to enforce payment, it was now their duty to take measures to prevent the occurrence of such a contingency. Soon after these observations were made in the House, Mr. McDuffie offered and supported in the Senate resolutions declaring that the government has no power to assume the debts of States contracted for their own purposes. The resolutions which Mr. Adams now proposed were three. The *first* declares that for a State to repudiate a debt contracted by the authority of its legislature, is a violation of that clause of the Constitution which prohibits the passing of 'any law impairing the obligation of contracts.' The *second* declares that if any State shall involve herself in a war with a foreign power in consequence of repudiation, the government of the United States has no power to involve *them* in such war. The *third*, that a State, involving herself in such war will cease to be a State of this Union, and will have no right or claim to any aid from the United States.

Before Mr. Adams proposed these resolutions, Mr. Cost Johnson of Maryland, had made a report from a select committee on his project for the relief of the States, which concluded with a resolution that it is expedient to employ the credit of the United States for the relief of the States to the extent of 200,000,000 Mr. Adams, who was on the same committee, offered his resolutions as a minority report, to be adopted in case the other was rejected; and he moved the printing of them. Mr. Wise attempted to exclude them as not receivable, but the Speaker ruled that they were. The question on Mr. Adams's motion was decided in the negative, *yeas* 72, *nays* 108. These resolutions arrested strongly the attention of the House, and caused considerable sensation. Cost Johnson's report is ordered to be printed, and will probably contain much interesting matter.

The resolutions of Mr. Adams were well-timed as a warning to south-western and north-western States not to expect help, in the piratical affair of repudiation, from the northern States. I think that the doctrine of repudiation is gaining ground. The helpless territory of Florida has repudiated by a nearly unanimous vote; and it seems to be expected that Indiana and Illinois will do likewise. Meantime the two antagonist schemes of *repudiation* and *assumption* are infusing themselves into the opposite parties, and, by the time the country gets ready to enter in earnest upon the next election, will have acquired a paramount importance. Certain it is, that either general repudiation, or assumption by the general government must come. The intimate relation which this government may have to State measures of this sort, is illustrated by certain occurrences subsequent to the revolution. The State of Virginia passed a law, repudiating substantially all debts owed by Virginia to British subjects. The debtors were not relieved from them, but were ordered to pay them into the treasury of the State. In respect to British creditors and to the State, it was repudiation. When the British saw this, they refused to surrender the American posts all along the northern and north-western line. The Supreme Federal Court decided that the act of Virginia was unconstitutional; the money was paid over, and the affair thus happily ended. It was, however, in consequence of this case, that the mischievous amendment was introduced into the Constitution, that no State should be made a party to a suit in favor of an individual of another State, or of a foreign nation.

The *third* set of resolutions declared that five out of the nine Judges of the Supreme Court ought to be appointed from free States; that the next chief justice ought also to be appointed from a free State, and after that, alternately from free slave States.

The fourth and last set of resolutions were offered late in the evening of the 3d of March, and the ordinary din of this riotous assembly was so increased by the admission of women into the members' seats, (a very absurd thing, of which many deposed members complained bitterly out of the hearing of the fair usurpers) that I could not hear distinctly. The purport was that any naval or military commander who shall, without authority, make invasions or depredations upon any foreign territory or people, ought to be surrendered to the government of such nation to be dealt with according to the laws thereof, in such case made and provided. This proposition of course refers to the late affair at Monterey. If we had enacted such a law at an early period of our history, it would have saved us from the greatest misfortune and disgrace, that have ever befallen us as a people.

You will have observed by speeches and votes which I have heretofore noticed, how faithfully Mr. Cushing has labored to qualify himself for his recent nomination by a Virginia slaveholder, breeder and trader, for the high office of Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Cushing possesses talents more than ordinarily suited to that station. As to his moral fitness, I choose to leave him to the verdict of your readers upon the facts heretofore stated. Only three days ago, he made a fresh effort to enhance his claims upon Mr. Tyler by appending quite gratuitously to his speech on the British treaty the following:

'He had only this to add, before he took leave of the subject. On this, as on other occasions, the U. States had ample cause to regret that she had ever given in to *sentimental legislation*. The only debateable point in this whole matter, and it was a debateable point—was a question under the law of nations, which might arise on the *piracy* statute. We had taken a false step, when we gave a false name to the slave trade'!!

This is progress. This is echoing the democratic autocrat of all South Carolina! It was the Southern representation, which proposed and urged the enactment of this 'piracy statute'; and they found it excellent, so long as it operated simply to *protect the domestic slave trade, and to secure to Virginia slave-breeders a monopoly of the domestic slave market*; but now, when their own branding-iron, held in abolition hands, is burning deep into their consciences, this same terrific word, they would fain repudiate it! A *conventional* conscience shrinks so much the more from these terrible letters of the law. But it cannot be done. They themselves dare not propose it, though I can see plainly that they are aiming to prepare the public mind apace for its repeal. But they cannot repeal the dictionary. We shall see what will come of all this corrupt, complicated, and accumulated plotting—this vast and malignant villany. Something awful, I am sure—a world-lesson, beyond all doubt. Mr. Cushing was listened to on this 'sentimental topic' with evident delight by one portion of the House, and with strong disgust by another. The slave-breeders were grateful to him, for saying for them, that which they could not, without confusion of face, say for themselves. They manifested the same overflowing glee that they did a few days ago, when, in reply to Mr. Giddings's manly and impressive speech,

> He took his cue from Wise, and told
> A sentimental tale,
> How cruel men *kidnapped and sold*
> An *unoffending whale*.

But I must hasten to that denouement which is the object of this narrative. On Friday evening, the 3d of March, 1843, there was gathered in the pillared hall of the palace of the slave-king, 'the chivalry' of the South and the beauty of the new world. With the solemn decrees of the awful monarch were mingled the sweet voices of a thousand enchantresses. A thousand brilliant lights were obscured by two thousand still more brilliant; for these threw their rays into the soul. Mr. Cushing, the observed of all observers, had just finished a speech 'in holiday and lady terms,' commending universal love and perpetual union to the liege men of the great monarch. The syren voice of flattery said to the flushed hero, 'There is no doubt that *you* will go.' His other self, Sir Henry de Slavepen, had also with his blandest accents pleased

'The listening fancy's ear.'

'I *leave* this House,' he said, 'with nought but kindness in my heart.' It was now 'the witching time of night.' Suddenly, the crowd was agitated, and every face was upturned to the muse of history standing on high; and lo! on her tablet was graved this fatal word—

REJECTED!

It appears that both Cushing and Wise were nominated *three* times. This pertinacity, on the part of the President, was absurd, undignified, and disrespectful to the Senate. On the first nomination, there were in favor of Cushing 19, against him 27. On the second, 10 in favor, and 27 against; and the third, 2 to 29.

For Wise, on the first nomination, there were 12, against him 24; on the second, 8 to 26; and on the third, 2 to 29!

There are various rumors as to the specific causes of these rejections. It is said that Benton was hostile to Wise, because he once called him 'a thief.' I believe that neither of them has much right to take offence at the name. They would either of them call me a thief, or something worse, if I were to rob them of one day's pay. Robbing is taking by force against the will of the person robbed. Slaveholders take by force of whips, guns, patrols, stocks, chains, and starvation. That it is against the will of the enslaved need not be argued. The whips, chains and drivers argue the question for us. An objection made to Wise is said to have been that he is too impetuous to be entrusted with so important a mission as that to France.

As to Mr. Cushing, I am informed that his famous speech, called 'the auctioneering speech,' was taken up and analyzed; and the question put to the Senate, 'Are you willing to confide the Treasury to the care and keeping of a man who has avowed such principles, and in office will carry them out?' It is also said that it was objected to the appointment of Cushing, that there was already one head of Department from Massachusetts; whereupon Mr. Choate and Mr. Archer stated that they were authorized to say, that Mr. Webster would vacate the Department of State in ten days. It is reported that he is going to England. Mr. Everett is appointed to China. Whatever other reasons may be given, I cannot doubt that the extraordinary fact, that here were two gentlemen, distinguished (undoubted as their talents are) as much by treachery to their friends and to their principles, as by any or all things else, claiming at the hands of those friends the most splendid rewards in the gift of the government, precisely *because they had been* treacherous, must have had great weight.

W. W. Irwin was confirmed as Charge des Affaires to Denmark. This may seem to militate against the above position, for he is of the guard. But that post is of inferior importance, and Irwin is a quiet, harmless man. A joke was made of a familiar quotation from Shakspeare, in various quarters, as soon as his nomination was announced. One member said, 'Well, I have heard there was "sometding rotten in Denmark," and if there isn't, there *will be*.' Another said, 'I suppose the President thought there *must be* "something rotten in Denmark."'

It is understood that Messrs. Cushing and Wise intend to 'take the stump' in their respective districts.

'La guarde meurt, et ne se ronde pas.'

D. L. C.

The letter of Mahlon Preston, Loudon Grove, Pa. containing twenty-two dollars, was duly received: and copies will be forwarded, according to direction, to Thos. Whitson, Joseph Mitchener, and Simpson Preston.

H. W. W.

To Correspondents.

We have received a manuscript of 23 pages from Joshua Wilder, of South Hingham, in reply to an allusion which was made to him in a report of the proceedings of the Plymouth County A. S. Society at that place, published in the Liberator of Jan. 27th. We must decline publishing it, for various reasons. It is too imperfect to appear in print—its great length is not adapted to the present crowded state of our columns—a large portion of it is not necessary to the personal vindication of the author—and it relates to an occurrence of local, and not general interest. Mr. Wilder conceives that he has received injustice at the hands of the reporter, and we shall therefore attempt to give as concisely as we can, in fairness to himself, what he says on that point.

The reporter charged him with having 'accused friend Boyle of misrepresentation and high coloring, in order to create an excitement.' He replies—'If 'G.' thinks that I anticipated any excitement from the few remarks that I made in the meeting, on the occasion that I believed called for them, he is no discerner of my spirit; for I spoke, as I told the meeting at the time, not to increase, but to allay excitement.' It was particularly 'in regard to the quiet of the ladies' that he made his remarks, as he was apprehensive that they 'might be alarmed for their safety,' in consequence of hearing Mr. Boyle assert 'that we had no law to protect any free citizen from immediate slavery.' He is satisfied that his remarks 'very much lessened, rather than increased the excitement of any one, excepting Mr. Boyle and his abettors.' He says he did not hear Mr. Russell call him 'friend Quaker Wilder,' and thinks 'G.' applied the epithet to him 'in derision or scorn,' but feels no uneasiness on that point. In reply to the statement, that, after it was too late to do much good, he retracted his accusations against Messrs. Boyle and Remond, he says—'Supposing, as I did, that these men were, beyond all doubt, infatuated men, and not sane on this subject, I exonerated them from designedly overstating and coloring the dangers to slavery, to which they said we were exposed, in defiance of all law. I admitted that they might be honest, but I said to them, I do not believe as you do.' He admits that the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Prigg vs. Pennsylvania puts in jeopardy the security of free citizens, but not to the extent represented by Mr. Boyle and others. By a strange blunder, he says that that decision 'annulled the law of Congress of 1793,' which was 'enacted for the more perfect security of the free citizen'!! From the language used by Mr. Remond, he 'was convinced that, on the subject of slavery, he (Mr. R.) was far from being a sound man.' He complains of 'G.' for reporting that 'South Hingham is almost *terra incognita* to anti-slavery,' and accuses him of having twice before insulted the intelligence of the people of that place. For one, he pleads 'not guilty of either ignorance or want of interest in the welfare of the bondman and his master; and he makes the same plea in behalf of his fellow-citizens generally.' He calls himself 'as thorough an anti-slavery person as is G. or Mr. Boyle,' and proceeds to cite instances in which he has circulated anti-slavery publications for several years past. He says that 'fanaticism is a malady of mind most easily cured, if there is no food administered to it from without it.' Finally, he gives several reasons why he has stood aloof from the anti-slavery societies, and these are chiefly because he does not like their arguments or weapons.

We have thus given a comprehensive summary of this long manuscript, with which 'friend Wilder,' we trust, will be satisfied. 'G.' will perceive that no rejoinder is needed, and here let the matter drop.

☞ The proceedings of the A. S. Convention at Upton—the letters of John M. Fisk, Solomon West, 'Enorom,' 'Fair Play,' Richard Allen, Lewis Ford, Edmund Crosby, Jacob Ferris, and Nelson Bostwick—and a phrenological description of the character of Stephen S. Foster—are on file for insertion.

To the Rescue!

The abolitionists of 'Old Essex,' and elsewhere, without regard to color, clime, sex, sect or age, are earnestly invited to come to the Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held in this place on Wednesday next. We have thus far spared no pains in arranging the preliminaries, and shall be exceedingly disappointed if the friends of humanity do not rally, en masse, at this last trumpet-call for freedom. We have secured the services of some of the most devoted and zealous lecturers, and the Hutchinson family, or at least a part of them, have promised to be present. To one and all, again we say, COME, and have your pure minds stirred up by way of remembrance, and the blessing of those ready to perish rest upon you. Let us make 'a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether.'

ANTI-SLAVERY MEN AND WOMEN.

Andover, March 8, 1843.

NOTICES.

Anti-Slavery Conventions.

Abolitionists of Massachusetts, awake!

You are earnestly invited to co-operate with the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts A. S. Society to get up and sustain the Conventions, to be holden in the following places, and at the time specified below.

Charles Lenox Remond, James Boyle, C. M. Burleigh, J. N. Buffum, and other able speakers, will be present. It is expected Frederick Douglass will attend several of the Conventions.

The abolitionists in the towns where the meetings are to be held, are requested to appoint some of their number a committee to procure a house for the holding of the Convention, to scatter information of the meeting in the surrounding country, and to secure accommodation for the strangers from out of town.

Princeton—Friday,	March 3d.
Gardner—Saturday,	do. 4th.
Townsend—Monday,	do. 6th.
Groton—Tuesday,	do. 7th.
Concord—Wednesday,	do. 8th.
Stoneham—Saturday,	do. 11th.
Lowell—Monday and Tuesday,	do. 13th and 14th.
Andover—Wednesday,	do. 15th.
Haverhill—Thursday,	do. 16th.
Georgetown—Friday,	do. 17th.
S. Danvers—Saturday,	do. 18th.
Weymouth—Monday,	do. 20th.
N. Marshfield—Tuesday,	do. 21st.
E. Abington—Monday,	do. 22d.
— Bridgewater—Thursday,	do.

POETRY.

For the Liberator.

THE FIERY TRIAL.

'The fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.'

Eternal truth and heavenly light—
The light that shines from God's own throne—
Truth that is clothed in godlike might,
The truth that comes from God alone—
A fire shall light in every soul,
Through all the land, from pole to pole:—
Our works by fire must all be tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

The men that framed unequal laws,
And bound with chains whoe'er they could,
Alleging this the only cause,
Why on the people's necks they stood,
That some a colored skin did wear,
That more the female form did bear—
Must see their works by fire all tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

The priest that claimed the godlike power
To bind the feet, and chain the tongue,
And made a fellow-mortal cower,
On whose blest lips salvation hung;
Who robbed God's poor of timely aid,
Because some should not work, he said;
Will find his works by fire all tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

Woman, who made the cursed vow
Man to obey, instead of God—
Degrading her own soul to bow,
And wait a fellow-creature's nod;
Her birthright sold, made man her lord,
And took oppression for reward—
Shall have her works by fire all tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

Vain and ungodly custom, too,
That put the crown on Folly's head,
And gave the lazy what was due
To those, on whom the burden laid;
That cast the weak and needs down,
And helped rich sinners of renown;
By light and truth will soon be tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

Doctrines and creeds, throughout the world,
Taught and received as if from God,
To his high throne their darts have hurled,
And spread their conquests all abroad;
And blindly taught, that wrong and right
Are both most precious in God's sight;
Yet these by fire must all be tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

One rule for all, from first to last,
For rich and poor, for bond and free;
The word from God's own lips has passed—
The judgment waits both you and me;
The furnace shall consume the dross,
The gold remain without a loss;
By light and truth all must be tried,
And naught but holiness abide.

E. D.

'THE LAND OF THE FREE, AND THE HOME OF THE BRAVE.'

Hail, Land of my Birth! hear ye not on the wind,
The taunt ringing aye in the ears of mankind?
Your motto is false—you're a nation of knaves—
Away with your boast, or relinquish your slaves!

Away with your laws to the pit whence they came!
Are there hearts in your bosoms, and is there no shame?
How can ye profess in JEHOVAH to trust,
And still grind the face of his image to dust?

'*The Land of the Free!*' where the sons of the soil
Are destined for life to unrecompensed toil;
Where millions of men, as the census records,
Are treated as brutes by their civilized lords!

'*The Home of the Brave!*' 'tis most 'brave,' to be sure,
To plunder and torture the helpless and poor:
'Tis 'brave' to tear brethren and sisters apart,
And to sever their sire from the wife of his heart!

'Tis 'brave' to withhold every light from the soul,
And then call it stupid, benighted and dull:
Alas, the poor slave! if not fit to be free,
He's as fit as the pirate has taught him to be.

Go on, sordid wretch, and efface, if you can,
In yourself and your slave, all resemblance to man:
Though base laws may screen you from human award,
YOU CANNOT ESCAPE THE REVENGE OF THE LORD!

ARISE, BLOW THE TRUMPET!

BY W. M'GOWAN.

Arise! blow the trumpet, the jubilee hailing;
O Zion! proclaim what Jehovah hath wrought!
Let gratitude, over each rival prevailing,
Give fire to each word, and give life to each thought!
Exalt thy Redeemer; break forth into singing;
Like dew drops in number thy converts appear;
The isles of the West with salvation are ringing;
The negro re-echoes our jubilee year!

Arise! blow the trumpet, for slavery banished;
The negro is ransomed in body and mind;
For fetters, and scourges, and tortures are vanished,
And of their existence no wreck left behind.
See Africa, taking her harp from the willows,
Her children to welcome once more to her strand;
Who weep tears of joy, as they fly o'er the billows,
To plant the 'true vine' in their own fatherland.

Arise, blow the trumpet!—the East and her sages
The Shaster reject, and the Bible receive;
The darkness is past that deceived them for ages,
The true light now shines, and on Christ they believe.
O India, rejoice!—for thy suttee has fallen,
And Juggernaut, bending, shall soon kiss the ground;
These horrid delusions,—so cruel, appalling,—
The gospel of Christ shall for ever confound.

Arise, blow the trumpet!—God's promise, unshaken,
Assures us all nations his glory shall see;
O, Zion! thy tribes and thy watchmen awaken,
And soon we shall welcome the grand jubilee.
And see while we sing how the heavens are bowing,
And Jesus descends, o'er the nations to reign;
While Gentiles and Jews to his temple are flowing,
With joy to appear in his glorious train!

I HATE THAT DRUM.

I hate that drum's discordant sound,
Parading round, and round, and round;
To thoughtless youth it pleasure yields,
And lures from cities and from fields,
To sell their liberty for charms
Of tawdry lace and glittering arms;
And, when Ambition's voice commands,
To march, and fight, and fall, in foreign lands.

I hate that drum's discordant sound,
Parading round, and round, and round;
To me it talks of ravag'd plains,
And burning towns, and ruin'd swains,
And mangled limbs, and dying groans,
And widows' tears, and orphans' moans,
And all that Misery's hand bestows,
To fill the catalogue of human woes.

SCOTT OF AMWELL.

TO LIFE. BY MRS. BARBAULD.

Life! we've been long together,
Through pleasant and through cloudy weather;
'Tis hard to part, when friends are dear,
Perhaps 'twill cause a sigh, a tear;
Then steal away, give little warning,
Choose thine own time,
Say not good night, but in some higher clime
Bid me good morning.

CHRISTIAN REFORM.

Interesting Letter from England.

NEWCASTLE, (Eng.) Dec. 25, 1842.

TO WM. L. GARRISON:

MY DEAR FRIEND—I greet you across the wide ocean; I wish you health and happiness; and I pray that success may attend all your endeavors to promote the improvement and the welfare of mankind.

I have often heard of you, and I have sometimes had the opportunity of reading your paper, and though your views may not in all points agree exactly with my own, and though your way of expression may not always appear to me to be the best that might be employed, yet I have been led to regard you as a lover of truth, as a brother in Christ, and as a friend and benefactor of mankind. I believe God is employing you in shaking and in pulling down the strong-holds of sin, and in promoting the extension and establishment of his kingdom among men.

I am glad you are free from the bondage of sectarianism. I am glad you have thrown off the yoke of human authority, and placed yourself under the authority of Christ alone. There is not a lovelier sight under heaven to me, than the sight of an emancipated soul. I can see no beauty in man, while he remains a voluntary slave. Whether a man choose for his master a pope or a king, a bishop or a kidnapper, a captain or a conference, he loses his beauty and his glory, the moment he consents to be a slave. Whether his work be preaching or killing, whether it be stealing or ruling, if a man be a slave,—if he has given himself up to be guided or governed by another,—if he has hired himself or sold himself to any man or to any party, he is, in my view, a fallen, miserable creature. He has lost his form and comeliness; he has lost his worth and glory; he has forsaken God; he has lost his Maker's image; he has become an object of pity to the pure spirits of heaven, and an occasion of horrible exultation to the bad spirits of hell. When a man relinquishes his freedom, he falls from the rank of the sons of God, and however he may be clothed, whether in black or red or brown, and however he may be fed, whether on husks or on dainties, and whatever may be his work, whether talking or writing, or preaching or fighting, he is a fallen, an abject, a miserable man; a pitiful and mournful wreck. But a man that asserts his freedom—that is resolved to think, and speak, and act as the servant of God alone,—the man that looks after truth, and embraces it whenever he finds it; the man that inquires after the will of God, and does it as soon as he discovers it; the man that regards the authority of man as usurpation, and that looks on bishops and kings, on synods and conferences, on armies and gaolers, and mobs, without fear,—the man whose only creed is the doctrine of Christ, whose only law is the will of God, and whose whole soul and life, under the influence of godly love, are devoted to the cause of God and human happiness,—the man who, without respect to any authority on earth, and without any regard to any consideration of selfish ease or pleasure, or of worldly wealth or greatness, thinks, reads, talks, writes, eats, drinks, lives, toils and dies, that he may please his Maker and bless his fellow-man, is the most lovely, the most venerable, the most godlike sight on earth. He is the image of God, and the glory of man. He stands at the head of the creation of God, and takes rank next to the great Leader and Saviour of mankind. God is not ashamed to call him his son; Christ is not ashamed to acknowledge him as his brother. He is one with God; he has fellowship with God, and with his Son Jesus Christ; he works with God and with his Son in holy partnership; he takes his share in the great and glorious plan of enlightening and redeeming, of raising and blessing the whole family of man. This is man's greatness and glory; it is his perfection and blessedness. It matters not how a man be circumstanced, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in a garret, or dwell in a comfortable house, or have not where to lay his head; it matters not what may be his country, or what may be his color; if he love God and his fellow-men,—if ceasing to be the slave of earth and of hell, he asks only what *God* would have him to do; if while he lives on earth, he lives only to glorify his God and bless mankind; he is a great, an honorable, a glorious, and a godlike being.

I am glad to learn that there are some such men in America, and I am especially glad to see reason to believe that the number of such men is increasing in your land. There are men and women that are sighing and toiling after this blessedness in the islands of Britain. There are men and women in these islands that call no man father upon earth, and that call no man master; who acknowledge none as their father but God, and who call no man master but Christ. There are men and women who regard the claims of sects and governments to rule their judgments and their consciences as an infernal usurpation. There are men and women who have asserted their liberty to think and act for themselves as the servants of God alone; who have thrown off the yoke of the oppressor, and have declared their resolution to be free before the whole world. There are men and women who are crucified to the world, and who live only to God: who, at the call of Christ, have given up their all, and taken up their cross and followed him. There are men and women in these lands, who are delivered from the fear of man, and from the fear of death: who know no evil but sin, and who covet no portion but the favor and blessing of God. There are men and women who love their fellow-men, and who take pleasure in employing their wealth, in spending their time, and in exerting to the utmost their powers both of body and mind in the work of regenerating and blessing the human race. There are men and women who have suffered reproach and persecution for the sake of Christ, and who are willing to suffer still further, rather than fail in their duty to God or to mankind. There are those who have become so far enlightened and changed by the religion of Christ, that they trust neither in earthly riches nor in earthly power; but in the living God alone. There are some in these lands who have made such proficiency in the knowledge of Christ, that they are counted, by the wise ones of the land,—as their Master before them was,—mad; who have such a strong and undivided faith in God, that they are reckoned infidels; and who have made such proficiency in christian holiness, that they are counted, by the selfish and carnal professors of the day, unfit to live.

And the number of such men and women is increasing in these lands. The light and influence of the religion of Christ are spreading. Men and women in connexion with the various sects, are receiving fresh light, and awaking to new life. And many that were sleeping away their days in dreams of fleshly pleasure, have been roused from their guilty slumbers, and been brought to give themselves to God. Men and women are meeting together, not as believers in Wesley, or Calvin, or Fox; but as believers in Christ alone; and they are laboring, not as the servants of bishops, or conferences, of sects, or governments, but as the servants of God, and as the friends of mankind. Sectarians have begun to rage and persecute, and the enslavers of the souls of men are beginning to tremble. The babels which they have built are shaking, and some of them are tottering to their fall. A great and glorious revolution has commenced, and it is going rapidly forwards, and it is manifest to many, that brighter and better days draw nigh. What sorrows and struggles may remain for us, we cannot tell: we expect our sufferings to be greatly multiplied for a while, at least; but we have not a doubt but truth and righteousness will triumph, and that light and purity, and peace and joy shall roll through the world like a flood. We believe the day will come when men shall long to be lords over their fellow-men no more; when acts of fraud and violence shall cease; and when all the children of men shall live in loving and delightful fellowship, an image of the society of heaven.

I feel resolved, by the blessing of heaven, to live and pray and labor for that day. I feel resolved to be separate from all systems of violence and blood. I feel resolved to be neither master nor slave to any one on earth. I will be free, by the blessing of God. Men may lodge me in a jail; they may afflict my flesh; but, by the blessing of heaven, I will still be free. They shall not, if God will help me, enslave my mind.

Man cannot be a slave outright, but by his own consent. Men may chain or imprison, they may flog or kill the body, but there is nothing more that they can do. They cannot kill the soul. If men are resolved to act freely, there is no power, either on earth or in hell, that can enslave them. The truth as it is in Jesus makes all that receive it free. It delivers them from the fear of whips and chains and death; it raises them above the fear of reproach and torture; and the man that is delivered from the fear of what his fellow-man can do unto him, is emancipated. He begins from that time to judge for himself what is God's will, and to act according to his judgment. He cannot judge and act with freedom without incurring reproach and persecution, it is true, but he is still free. If God allow men to afflict his body, he cannot murmur; for all things work together for good to them that love God. That which constitutes a man's freedom is deliverance from the fear of reproach and violence; deliverance from the fear of suffering and of death.

I say, then, that man cannot be enslaved but by his own ignorance or guilt. Men may command us to profess faith in what we believe to be false; they may command us to do what we believe to be wrong; they may forbid us to do what we believe to be required of us by God; but they cannot compel us to *obey* them. They may tell us that if we do not profess what they command us to profess, and do what they command us to do, they will call us heretics, rebels, unbelievers, and madmen; but if we are above the fear of reproach, those threats will have no power over us; we shall still be free. They may drive us from their company, they may drag us from our homes, they may shut us up in dungeons, they may send us beyond the seas, or they may take away our lives; yet, after all, if we are above the fear of suffering and death, they cannot, by their cruelties, drive us from our integrity; they cannot make us slaves. It is the fear of man, it is distrust in God, that makes men slaves; and it is deliverance from the fear of man, it is confidence in God, it is the firm belief of the truth as it is in Jesus, and a surrender of our all to God, that makes men free. Every man is a slave that fears man, or distrusts God. Every man is a slave that is a stranger to the truth, or a rebel against God; and every man is free that knows the truth, and that is satisfied with the favor of God, and the testimony of a good conscience, and the hopes of heaven as his portion. We will take your American slaves. What is it that makes them slaves, but their ignorance of the truth, and their fear of torment and death? Let them once know the truth, and so receive it into their hearts as to be delivered from the fear of whips, fires and chains, and their slavery would be at an end. Their masters have power only to command and punish them; they have no power to make them *obey*; and if they have the courage and determination to think and act for themselves, without regard to any terrors but the frown of God, and without regard to any portion but his favor, they are as free as ourselves. They might have to suffer for using their freedom, and so may we; but that would not make them slaves. They might have to die for using their liberty; but, if kept above the fear of death, they would still be free. Christ and his apostles suffered and died for using their liberty, but they were not slaves. Most of God's children have been reproached and persecuted, when they have eagerly pursued the truth, and boldly and faithfully carried out the principles of the gospel; but we have never been accustomed to regard our persecuted and martyred ancestors as slaves. Had they been slaves, they might have escaped their sufferings. Had they feared reproach, violence, or death, they would have given up their religion; they would have obeyed the men that claimed the right to command or punish them, and the tyrants would have been satisfied. But the truth had made them free; it had delivered them from the fear of man; it had lifted them above the influence of the flesh and of the world; it had made them deaf to the commands and threats of usurping men, and hence their sufferings. If the usurpers had found them slaves, governed by the hopes and fears of time, or if they had found them subjugating reason and conscience to the will and pleasure of the flesh, or if they could have *made* them slaves, they could have *retained* their fears of suffering and death by terrible representations, or partial inflictions of their tortures: the martyrs might then have been permitted to live in quiet. But whom the *truth* makes free, are free indeed. Raised above earthly and fleshly considerations, man has no power to bring them under him, no means of bending them to his will. He has, therefore, no choice, when he meets with such characters, but either to let them alone when he finds he cannot enslave them by his cruelties, or else dismiss them from the earth, and then their emancipation is complete. Men cannot, therefore, be slaves, but by their own consent; they cannot be slaves but through the influence of ignorance, or the power of carnal affections and selfish principles.

And from all these great enslavers, I am resolved, by the blessing of Heaven, to be free. I feel resolved to seek after gospel truth with increasing diligence, and to reduce it to practice, when I discover it, with increasing faithfulness. I feel resolved to crucify the affections and desires of the flesh, and to cherish those higher principles of love to God, and love to man, and scrupulous regard to the suggestions or reproofs of conscience. I have experienced something of the emancipating power of gospel truth, and I am wishful to experience it in all its fullness. I feel something of that godlike freedom which consists in deliverance from the fear of reproach, and want, and death, and I long to feel still more. I feel resolved to use the freedom which I enjoy at present, until I have, by the blessing of God, worked out my full emancipation.

As I have said already, I am resolved to seek after truth. I am resolved to endeavor to understand whatever God has been pleased to reveal. I am resolved to search the scriptures, and to endeavor to find out their meaning. I am resolved to judge as to their meaning for myself. I will not bind myself either by the interpretations of the ancients or of the moderns, nor will I be ruled by the authority either of pope or bishop, of parliament or conference. I will judge for myself. I will prove all things which I hear or read of human origin, by the teachings of Jesus Christ, and both hold fast that which appears to me to be in accordance with his teaching, and cast from me that which is at variance with it. If bishops or popes, if parliaments or conferences, if synods or assemblies, if ancients or moderns, if single writers or preachers can help me in judging, I shall be glad to have their help; but they must not do my judging for me. I must judge for myself. I will acknowledge no master but Christ. And when I have discovered the truth, or when, after a free and full investigation, and recourse in prayer to the Great Father of Lights, for his assistance and blessing, any thing presents itself to my mind as manifestly the truth of Christ, I feel resolved to receive it to my heart, and to allow it to exert its proper influence on my life. I feel resolved to profess it, and teach it to others, as their wants may appear to require, or as a sense of duty to God and to my fellow-men may prompt. I will neither turn away my own eyes from the truth, when it presents itself, nor will I, when I have received it to myself, refuse to profess it or declare it to others. I will not keep back from my christian brethren, or from the world at large, any thing that may seem likely to be profitable to them. I should not like my brethren to hide in their hearts from me any useful truth, and I feel resolved not to hide in my own heart any useful truth from them.

And I feel resolved to reduce whatever truth I may discover to practice. Whatever may appear to me to be a command of Christ, I feel resolved to obey; whatever may appear to me at variance with his commands, I feel resolved to shun. I am as wishful to be right in my temper and behavior, as I am to be correct in my views of christian truth. I feel resolved, by the help of God, to be a follower of Christ in all things, and to be a follower of no one else, except so far as they themselves may be simple followers of Christ.

And though this course should make me singular, as singular as John the Baptist was, or as singular as Christ himself, I feel resolved to pursue it. Though it should lead me away from every creed that mortals ever framed, and cause me to trample upon every law that either earthly governments or degenerate churches ever made, I feel resolved, by the blessing of God, to go forward. Though men should thrust me out of their synagogues, though they should turn me out of their sects, and shut me out of their company; though they should revile me, and say all manner of evil against me; though they should call me a heretic, a rebel, or an infidel; though they should regard me as a madman or a devil, it is all one; I feel persuaded that the course on which I have entered is the right one, and I am resolved to walk in it. And though I should, by walking in it, offend my hearers, and drive away my congregations, and alienate my friends, and lose my mortal supporters, and be left alone; though I should be reduced to want, and left without a place where I may lay my head; though I should be dragged before magistrates, shut up in a dungeon, or delivered over to death, I am resolved, by the grace of God strengthening me, to hold on my course to the end.

We have had servility enough among the professed followers of Christ; it is time we had something else. It is time that superstition and intolerance should be shocked; it is time that the terrors of the scribes and pharisees, and of the whole band of selfish, temporizing hypocrites, should be set at naught. It is time that the minds of God's people should act freely, and that the yokes and fetters which earth and hell have fastened on them should be shaken off. It is time for us to go forth, to explore and reveal to our brethren the whole word of gospel truth, and to take our places on the mountains of God's holiness, and become the lights of the world, cities set on hills that cannot be hid. And, if I may speak in behalf of some who think and feel in harmony with me, we are resolved, by the help of God, to do so. We are wearied with the earthliness and selfishness of the mass of professors; we are wearied with their blindness and intolerance; and we are resolved to bring about a reformation, or to die in the attempt. But death will not frustrate our endeavors. As it was in the case of Christ, so would it be in the case of his followers; the death of the martyrs would be the life of their cause. God will preserve his people alive, till they have done all that life could do; he will not suffer them to die, till their death is likely to do a greater amount of good, than their continuance in life would do. A great and glorious change has begun among the people of these lands, and among the nations of the world at large, and we are persuaded that it will continue to go forward, till the earth shall be filled with the glory of God, and till the whole family of man shall rejoice in the blessings of the gospel of peace. But I must conclude. I did not think of writing so long a letter when I began; I thought only of writing a few lines: but when my soul had once become excited with thoughts of the land to which my letter was going, and of the events which are taking place both in this part of the world and your own, I did not feel at liberty to cut my letter short. It is but right, when one writes to a christian friend and brother so far away, that he should send a fair portion and sample of his soul with it. I do not, therefore, feel as if I had done wrong in writing to you at such great length; and I do not feel as if you were likely to blame me for so doing. I shall, therefore, make no apologies for the liberty I have taken. I only pray, that God may bless you, and make you an abundant blessing. Will you please accept, along with my long letter, the two pamphlets, entitled '*Non-Resistance*,' and '*Pure Gospel*.' Both the pamphlets and the letter are at your service; and I should be glad, if either you or your readers should receive pleasure or profit from perusing them. But I shall expect you, if you receive my letter and pamphlets with favor, to write and tell me so, and to accompany your acknowledgment of their reception, with all the loving and gladly news you may be able to communicate. And I shall be all the more thankful if I hear from you soon. Farewell! The Lord that made heaven and earth bless thee out of Zion. The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; the name of the God of Jacob defend thee. Send thee help from the sanctuary, and strengthen thee out of Zion. Remember all thy offerings, and accept thy burnt sacrifices. Grant thee according to thine own heart, and fulfil all thy counsel. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with you. Amen.

A friend and brother in Christ Jesus,
JOSEPH BARKER.

P. S. You will see a few words in the pamphlet on Non-Resistance, on the subject of gentleness and justice in speaking of the erring and ungodly: you must make the best use of it you can, and send me the best advice you have to give in return.

Hireling Butchers and Murderers.

At a Peace Meeting held in the Royal Exchange, Dublin, (Ireland,) on Wednesday evening, Dec. 29th, JAMES HAUGHTON in the chair—the proceedings of which are published in the Dublin Morning Register—after excellent speeches by the chairman and Mr. William Antisel—

Mr. H. C. Wright, of Philadelphia, was introduced by the Chairman, and he was received with many demonstrations of kindness. He said—Mr. Chairman, I scarcely know how to begin what I have to say to you this evening. I have had to say hard things of my own slaveholding country, and I must also say some plain things to yourselves. You are culpable in not making yourselves acquainted with the institutions under which you live, civil, religious, and military; it is your duty to get information on all those subjects. You may be oppressed, and you will be oppressed in ignorance—willing ignorance—on these subjects. It is the military institution to which I wish to call your attention this evening. It absorbs, I understand, one third of all the revenues of your country; you have a deep interest in this matter; you pay all the cost. The man who would prevent you from inquiring into what so deeply interests you, is a tyrant, and your enemy. Let us suppose a question: many men in Dublin are in want of employment; now, I want one hundred thousand men to work for me. Well, my friends, you would like to know something of the work I should require you to do. As men of common sense, you would like to know something about this matter. Well, then, the work I want you to do is, to become human butchers. I'll put the knife, called a sword, into your hand—you are to slay and destroy all whom I order you to kill; you are to have no conscience; that would be a troublesome companion to any man in my employment; you are to have no God; I am to be your commander; you are to kill, burn, and destroy, father, mother, wife, child, or dear friend, when I order it. These are some of my terms—will you come and labor for me? (No, no, not one of us.) You won't take employment on my terms; but I have not told you all. If you come into my service, I shall have to do a great many things to you, if you disobey my commands. Listen to me for a while—I'll tell you some of them. [Mr. Wright here read extracts from the military code of England, which denounces death for a number of offences.] Now, will you enlist in my service? (No, no, we won't.) What, not take service with me! not agree to blow out men's brains—burn towns—make widows and orphans! Not do this work for me, although I'll pay you fourpence a day, and food and raiment, for the work! If the Chairman, James Haughton, were to agree to my terms, what would you call him? A murderer—a human butcher—and such he would be! Suppose twenty-five millions of men ask you to accompany them in this bloody work; will they be less murderers and butchers? Surely not, brethren. I was a soldier myself, and I tell you the soldier's profession is that of a hired assassin. When the sergeant asks you to enlist, does he tell you all this work you will have to do, and all these penalties you will have to bear? No, my friends; he'll tell you of the honor of the soldier, the glory of war, the red coat you'll wear. God preserve us from all such honor, and such glory—the glory and honor of slaying our brethren, and making widows and orphans! Why, my friends, the glory gained by Ireland, in shaking off the vice of drunkenness, is far above all the false honor gained by all the armies and all the victories that ever disturbed the world. (Much cheering.) My friends, do not foster the spirit of revenge; we are practically told that revenge is a virtue, and that the christian spirit of forgiveness is mean and spiritless; but, oh! this is not true—you have conquered the evil of drunkenness—rise up once more, in your moral might, and conquer another vice, the passion of revenge, and the war spirit which it fosters. I am told this is a dangerous doctrine—dangerous to whom? Is it to the warrior? Surely the peace man will not injure him. The war principle is only dangerous to tyrants, to slave-owners, ann to evil-doers of all kinds. These fear our principles, because we want to put an end to their practices. We are only dangerous to such as these. If I am robbed of my watch, am I to punish the robber? Suppose him to be my friend, J. Webb, who does me the injury; am I to punish him? No, my friends, I am to try and save my brother. If he won't be my brother, I'll ask you all to help me to reclaim him, not to punish him; we will leave all punishment to God. If we act thus, our brother will be saved. Do you think, my friends, the man will continue to do evil who has no one to fight against but God? No, no, he would not—we would save our brother. Let us overcome evil by good. I once knew two little boys to quarrel; one struck the other violently—did he return the blows? No, he fumbled in his pocket, and found a piece of candy there; he thrust it right into his opponent's mouth; the quarrel was over in an instant! When you want to fight, my friends, always do so with a piece of sugar candy in your hands.

Mr. Wright illustrated his sentiments with the most pleasing and delightful anecdotes, which we would gladly publish, if our space admitted of it. We never heard more pleasing stories—his audience were held in mute attention. He took his seat amid much cheering.

Daniel O'Connell and American Slavery.

At a recent meeting of the Irish Repeal Association in Dublin—

Mr. Gilligan handed in 3l. 7s. 10d. from St. George's ward. The contributions were accompanied by a letter from Mr. James Haughton, of Eccles-street, who forwarded 1l. as his renewed subscription for the present year.

Mr. Ray then read Mr. Haughton's letter, which was received with loud cheers.

Mr. O'CONNELL said the letter was of the utmost importance, and should be inserted on the minutes. The sentiments which it breathed of the highest tone of humanity made it most valuable. There was not a more excellent gentleman in the community than Mr. Haughton; he was, in fact, the very apostle of benevolence and charity (cheers.) He (Mr. O'Connell) was afraid the terms of the treaty entered into with America by Lord Ashburton were too distinct in favor of the American slave-owner. The administration were in such a melancholy state, and they were so mixed up with Lord Ashburton, that he might as well ask Sir Robert Peel and his supporters to swallow the rivers of Canada as to get them to make any change in the terms of the treaty. That treaty was mischievous, and it was idle for Mr. Haughton, or any man, to expect that any member, standing up in the House of Commons, would make any impression on the government. The anti-slavery party must again go to Exeter Hall, and threaten every member of the House, calling on them to desert every administration that did not vindicate the right of every man to be free (hear, hear.) It would be impossible otherwise to obtain any thing favorable from England. England had truckled to America, and it was the Anti-Slavery Society alone who could do what Mr. Haughton called on them in his letter to do. As to India, Mr. Haughton was quite right; there were millions of slaves in India. India was still contaminated with the stain of slavery, and belied the old adage, that wherever England's flag flies, all were free. He had long wished to address the Irish in America, and he had now an opportunity of doing so, for he had received a communication from the Irish in Philadelphia, contradicting the report that they had been engaged in the late riots there. In reply to that, he would publish an address to the Irish in Philadelphia, and that reply would be an answer to the arguments put forward by a correspondent of the Dublin Evening Post, whose letter was dated from Philadelphia. He trusted he should be able to convince the writer of that letter, as well as the American public who agreed with him, that his (Mr. O'Connell's) views on the subject were just and well-founded (hear, hear.)

From the National A. S. Standard.

Southern Chivalry.

Less is known of Mr. Motte, Unitarian clergyman of Boston, than of Mr. Pierpont, in the anti-slavery cause; but he, too, deserves gratitude for his manly advocacy of truth, at the expense of popularity. His scorching rebukes to southern slavery and northern prejudice, are worth more from him than from any other man, because he was born and educated in South Carolina. He has, moreover, proved the sincerity of his words by his *works*.—When his father died, several slaves fell to his share, in the division of the estate. He immediately ordered that they should all receive their freedom. But, unfortunately, these slaves had husbands, wives and children, who belonged to other masters; and if they received their freedom, the law would compel them to quit South Carolina. Having a small share of worldly goods, he was unable to purchase the families of his bondmen. But he did the best he could. He ordered them to be sold to masters of their own choosing, and to none other, whatever price might be offered; and he placed the money in suitable hands, as a fund for the use of the slaves themselves, and their heirs forever; declining to touch either principle or interest himself.

A society in Savannah, Ga. lately sent to the Unitarian Association in Massachusetts, to send them a preacher to officiate for six months. Mr. Motte, being at leisure, was selected as a suitable person. On landing at Savannah, he sought out the committee of the church. All being met, one of them opened the business by saying that a very unpleasant rumor had reached them the day before; he trusted Mr. Motte would be able to contradict it, as otherwise, it would lead to disappointment on both sides. When Mr. Motte begged an explanation, they informed him that it was said he entertained sentiments unfavorable to the institution of slavery. He replied that the charge was unquestionably true. He was a southerner by birth and education, but on that subject he had never doubted. He had spoken freely at the North against slavery, though not more freely than he had spoken years before at the South. He was no Garrison man, and not connected with any anti-slavery societies.

The committee said it would not be an insurmountable objection that he was opposed in *sentiment* to slavery, provided he had never *avowed* it; but they had heard that he once preached a very objectionable sermon at Dr. Channing's church in Boston. Mr. Motte replied that he recollected the sermon very well; but that it related to a weakness and crime which did not exist at the *South:* viz. prejudice against color. In that sermon, he said that if Jesus were to re-appear on earth, with his Asiatic complexion, he could not be sure of an exemption from insult, even in the churches of his professed followers. 'What you have said, however, settles the question,' said Mr. Motte; 'for, on other occasions, I have taken much stronger ground in my own pulpit, than I took at that time.'

The committee consisted of *northern men;* but they replied, that, under such circumstances, he could not be permitted to enter their pulpit. The interview ended with cold civility on the part of most, and with excited and unkind language from one or two.

This was on Saturday, and the boat was to return on Monday morning. When Mr. Motte informed the chairman that he intended to return in her, that gentleman promised to meet him at the boat, and left him. However, he did not make his appearance. Not a word was said about the payment of expenses; and Mr. M. was left to find his way back to Boston, so destitute of means, that he was obliged to travel with the utmost expedition, and eat but one meal a day, in order to make his scanty purse hold out.

PROPOSALS
FOR
PUBLISHING A VOLUME
OF THE
Writings of William Lloyd Garrison.

The undersigned proposes to publish, (as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers can be obtained to warrant the undertaking,) a volume of SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON. The volume will be a duodecimo, of 300 pages or more, neatly printed on good paper, and substantially bound; with an Introduction by a distinguished friend of the anti-slavery cause. The Selections will comprise his best articles, both in Poetry and Prose, and the whole will be submitted to his personal inspection and revision.

The price of the volume will be *One Dollar* to single subscribers, payable on delivery.

Persons who will procure five subscribers, and be responsible for the same on the appearance of the work, shall be entitled to a sixth copy without further charge. The undersigned earnestly invites every subscriber of the Liberator, or of any other journal in which this advertisement shall appear, to exert himself of this offer, and to forward the names of subscribers to him, at 25, Cornhill, *post paid*.

The work will be delivered at the Anti-Slavery Offices in Boston, New-York, Philadelphia, and Providence, as subscribers may direct.

The profits, if any, will be applied to Mr. Garrison's own benefit.

OLIVER JOHNSON.

Boston, Feb. 22, 1843.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, Voice of Freedom, Herald of Freedom, Vermont Telegraph, and the Philanthropist, are requested to give this advertisement a few insertions, calling to it the attention of their readers; and they shall each receive for the same two copies of the work.

Situation Wanted.

AN individual, who has had ten years' experience at the printing business, is in want of a situation as a compositor or pressman, or to take charge of a newspaper establishment. He can produce satisfactory reference. A small compensation will be gratefully received. Address 'B. F. R.,' 25, Cornhill.

Boston, Feb. 9, 1843.

JUNIER'S OYSTER ROOM,
21 Howard-Street.

BILL OF FARE.

Clam Soup,

Oysters Raw, | Oysters Stewed,
" Roasted, | " Fried in Batter,
" Fried in Crumbs, | " " Meal,

Pies, &c. &c. &c.

N. B. Oysters for sale by the gallon or small measure.

Straw Bonnets, Fancy Goods, Millinery, &c.

No. 13, SUMMER-STREET, BOSTON.

A. E. MANN

WOULD inform her customers and friends, that she has increased her business, and keeps on hand an assortment of Fancy Goods, Stationery, Millinery, &c. Straw bonnets dyed, altered, cleansed and pressed, in a superior manner. Fashionable millinery attended to with neatness and despatch.

N. B. Bonnets of all kinds made to order.

Boston, Oct. 28, 1842.

BOARDING HOUSE FOR COLORED SEAMEN.

The subscriber begs leave to inform such colored seamen as may visit Boston, that he has opened an excellent Boarding House for their accommodation, on temperance principles, at No. 5, Sun Court Street, (first house below the Bethel Church,) and will be happy to receive their patronage. No pains will be spared on his part to make their situation pleasant and satisfactory. The rules of the house will be in accordance with good order and the principles of morality.

CHARLES A. BATTISTE,
No. 5, Sun Court Street, Boston.

Boston, June 8, 1842. (tf.)

UNION HOUSE.

THE subscriber has lately opened a genteel Boarding House, situated at No. 4 Southack-street.—The house has been put in complete repair, and is well calculated to accommodate all who may be disposed to award their patronage. Strangers visiting the city are solicited to call at the Union House, where every exertion will be made to render their sojourn a pleasant one, and that too on the most moderate terms.

Boston Sept. 30th, 1842. JOHN ELY.

The Finest Head of Hair produced by Wyeth's Cream of Lilies.

For sale only by the appointed agent, A. S. JORDAN, No. 2, Milk-street, second door from Washington-street

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

JUST Published and for sale at the Anti-Slavery Depository, No. 25 Cornhill,

THE COVENANT WITH JUDAS, a sermon by John Pierpont, occasioned by the imprisonment of George Latimer.

TEN YEARS EXPERIENCE. By Mrs. M. W. Chapman.

DR. CHANNING'S LAST ADDRESS, second edition, at $1 per hundred.

ANTI SLAVERY ALMANAC for 1843. By Mrs. L. M. Child.

A KISS FOR A BLOW, a collection of stories for children, by Henry C. Wright.

Also for sale, Dickens's Notes on America, Harper's edition.

Dec. 9.

THE TRICOPHEROUS,
OR MEDICATED COMPOUND,

IS now acknowledged by thousands, who use it daily, to be the only remedy to prevent baldness, and to restore the hair that has fallen off, or become thin; to prevent grey hair; to cure and remove every appearance of scurf and dandruff from the hair, and to keep it in the most healthy, soft and glossy state, yet free from all oily and greasy appearances. The chief virtues of the Tricopherous, or Medicated Compound, are: 1st, Its bracing, strengthening, and clarifying properties. 2d, Its gently stimulating the action of the skin. 3d, Its producing and encouraging a reaction in the bulb or root, and particularly in the pulp, which receives the vessels and nerves, giving life and vigor to the hair. 4th, Its equalizing the circulation of the fluids. 5th, Its freeing the skin from the effects of perspiration, scurf and dandruff, and disposing the hair to curl. 6th, And, its frequent use will preserve the hair in beauty and health to the latest period of life. For sale at A. S. JORDAN'S, 2 Milk, 2d door from Washington st, Feb. 17.

New State Register for 1843.

JAMES LORING, 132 Washington-street, has just published the MASSACHUSETTS REGISTER for 1843, containing the New Tariff of the United States, with the Tariff Law, the State Legislature, the 27th Congress, the Army and Navy Officers, Consuls, Militia Officers, City Officers of Boston, Salem and Lowell, Ministers, Colleges, Charitable Societies, Banks and Insurance Companies, Postmasters, Justices, Lawyers, U. S. Census of towns in Massachusetts, Members of the Mass. Medical Society, State appointment, Treaty with China, Boundary Question, Bankruptcy Commissioners, Boston Pilotage, &c. &c.

Feb 17.

AGENTS OF THE LIBERATOR.

RHODE-ISLAND.—Wm. Adams, *Pawtucket;*—Geo S. Gould, *Warwick.*

CONNECTICUT.—S. S. Cowles, *Hartford;*—John S. Hall, *East-Hampton;* James Monroe, *Canterbury;*—Charles S. Morton, *Albany:*—James C. Fuller, *Skaneateles;*—Thomas McClintock, *Waterloo;* John B. Barker, *Peru;* R. D. H. Yardley, *Ruskville;* Isaac Hartshorn, *Penn Yan.*

PENNSYLVANIA.—H. C. Howell, *Alleghany;*—J. B. Vashon, *Pittsburg;*—M. Preston, *West Grove;*—James Fulton, Jr., *McWilliamstown;*—Thomas Pratt *Enterprise;*—Thomas Hambleton, *Russelville;*—B. Kent, *Andrew's Bridge;*—John Cox, *Homerton;*—James